Metropolitan Borough of Stepney Public Libraries

REFERENCE DEPARTMENT.

WITHDRAWN

Class D 3541 No. 942.061

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM
LIBRARY SERVICE

Author

Title

BOOK STORE

Books or discs must be returned on or before the last date stamped on label or on card in book pocket. Books or discs can be renewed by telephone, letter or personal call unless required by another reader. After library hours use the Ansafone Service (01-698 7347). For hours of opening and charges see notices at the above branch, but note that all lending departments close at 1 pm on Wednesday and all libraries are closed on Sundays, Good Friday, Christmas Day, Bank Holidays

METROPOLITAN
SPECIAL COLLECTION

942.061

GUY FAWKES;

OR,

THE GUNPOWDER TREASON,

A.D. 1605;

WITH

A DEVELOPEMENT OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CONSPIRATORS:

AND

AN APPENDIX ON THE ANONYMOUS LETTER;

ALSO,

A FAC-SIMILE OF THE LETTER AND OF THE MIRACULOUS STRAW AS CIRCULATED IN 1606.

BY THE

REV. THOMAS LATHBURY, M.A.,

AUTHOR OF "A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH EPISCOPACY, FROM 1640 TO 1662," "THE SPANISH ARMADA," &c.

MILE END PUBLIC LIBRARY

THE SECOND EDITION, ENLARGED.

LONDON:
JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

M.DCCC.XL.

35611
D 942.061

PREFACE.

In sending forth a new edition of this little volume, I cannot but return my thanks to the public for their favourable reception of the former. The sale of a thousand copies of such a work proves that the subject has excited some interest amongst Protestants.

With respect to the seasonableness of such a publication there can scarcely be a difference of opinion among sound churchmen. When the Romanists are using their utmost exertions to destroy the evidences of the plot, it becomes necessary for Protestants to endeavour to perpetuate them. The aspect of the times; the rapid advances of Romanism; the appointment of certain Roman Catholics to important offices in the state; the addition to the number of popish bishops in England; the avowed determination on the part of many not to rest satisfied with anything short of the ascendancy of the church of Rome in this country; and the encouragement given to popery in high places; are circumstances which naturally direct the attention of a Protestant people to the principles of that church, which appears to be gaining strength in our land,

and whose pretensions are put forth in a manner unknown in England since the period of the Reformation. The Anglican church is the grand object of attack; because she is the great bulwark against the encroachments of popery.

The Gunpowder Treason is one of the darkest tragedies in our domestic history; and the present work contains a faithful narrative of that horrid conspiracy. The church of Rome is unchanged: the very principles, on which all the treasons of former reigns originated, are still retained; and if they are not carried out into practice, it is entirely owing to the altered circumstances of the world. Some inconsistent Protestants are constantly reiterating the assertion, that popery is quite a different thing from what it once was; yet the Papists themselves declare, that their principles are unchanged and unchangeable. Were it admitted that popery could be changed, the doctrine of *infallibility*, which is incompatible with change, would be renounced.

Some complaints were made against the former edition of the absence of references to authorities. It may be observed that the work was especially intended for those classes who never refer to authorities. As, however, others have favoured the work with a perusal, I have in the present edition supplied that deficiency. I have made considerable use of the valuable documents printed by Mr. Jardine from the

originals in the State Paper Office: and I have carefully perused CASAUBON's *Letter to Fronto Ducæus*, in which many particulars are detailed not to be found in any other work. Casaubon had access to all the documents which were in the hands of the government, and many of which are still preserved among the State Papers. Of Garnet's Letters he thus speaks: "Nam præter acta publica, inconcussæ fidei monimentum, quicquid mendax Cretensis allatret, illas quoque Garnetti Epistolas diligenter legimus, quas de se et rebus suis in Arce Londinensi scripsit plurimas."—CASAUBON, *Epist.* 408. It should be remarked, that the references are made to the edition of 1709, and not to the edition of the single letter published in 1611.

In the Appendix, I have entered on the question relative to the authorship of the Letter to Monteagle. The reader must form his own conclusions on the subject.

The *fac-simile* of the letter, with that of the autograph of Guy Fawkes, will be viewed with interest; while that of Garnet's straw will show how popery can resort to fraud and imposture for the purpose of supporting its pretensions.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

Page

A Sketch of Papal Attempts in England and Ireland, during the Reign of Elizabeth. The State of Religion and the Country on James's accession 1

CHAPTER II.

Sketches of the Conspirators 15

CHAPTER III.

Proceedings of the Conspirators, to the latter end of October, 1605 24

CHAPTER IV.

The Narrative continued down to the Period of the Discovery of the Treason 38

CHAPTER V.

The Proceedings of the Conspirators on the Discovery of the Plot—their Capture at Holbeach—The Meeting of Parliament 56

CHAPTER VI.

Proceedings against the Conspirators 70

CHAPTER VII.

The Jesuits implicated—proceedings against them—The Apprehension, Trial, and Execution of Garnet—The Miracle of the Straw—Garnet declared a Martyr . 81

Chapter VIII.

Page

The Principles of the Conspirators those of the Romish Church—Illustrations of those Principles—The English Exiles noticed by the Pope—Sir Everard Digby—Church of Rome implicated in the Plot 111

Chapter IX.

Roman Catholic Peers—Mordaunt—A Service prepared for the Occasion—Alterations in the Service to suit the Landing of King William—Conclusion . . . 133

APPENDIX.

No. I. The Anonymous Letter 143
No. II. The Act of Parliament 148

GUY FAWKES.

CHAPTER I.

A SKETCH OF PAPAL ATTEMPTS IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND DURING THE REIGN OF ELIZABETH. THE STATE OF RELIGION AND THE COUNTRY ON JAMES'S ACCESSION.

As an introduction to the subject, of which this volume professes more especially to treat, I purpose to give a sketch of the proceedings of the emissaries of Rome in this country, during the long reign of Queen Elizabeth. Queen Mary died A.D. 1558, when her sister Elizabeth succeeded her on the throne. Paul IV. at this time occupied the papal chair: but in less than a year after her accession he was removed by death, and was succeeded by Pius IV. Both these pontiffs were quiet and moderate men, compared with several of those who came after them. At all events, they did not proceed to those extremities to which their successors resorted. There were, indeed, parties in the court of Rome, who laboured to induce these pontiffs to excommunicate the queen, as a heretic and a usurper; but recollecting the fatal consequences which had issued from the hasty proceedings of Clement against Henry VIII., or, probably imagining that greater benefits would result from gentle than from violent measures, they pursued a moderate course, exhorting the queen to return to her allegiance to the see of Rome, and even making promises of concessions respecting the reformation. In 1566, Pius V. was promoted to the papal chair. In a very brief space he

gave indications of a departure from the moderate councils of his two immediate predecessors. The efforts of Philip II. of Spain were also, during the early years of this reign, directed to the same object with those of Paul IV. and Pius IV. The king was anxious to maintain his influence in England by a marriage with Elizabeth; and as long as he could entertain a hope that his wishes would be realized, he seconded the moderate measures of the Roman pontiff. His expectations on this subject were destined to disappointment; when perceiving that a marriage with the queen was out of the question, he directed his attention towards the accomplishment of his designs on this country by other means than those of treaty and diplomacy.

As soon as Pius V. was fixed in the papal chair a different line of policy was pursued towards England. Some few years, indeed, elapsed before the queen was actually excommunicated; but conspiracies and treasons were contrived at Rome, with a view to their execution, as soon as suitable persons could be found for the purpose.

Pius V. was the pontiff by whom the bull of excommunication against Elizabeth was issued. The document was dated March, 1569, or 1570, according to the present mode of computation. Hitherto the court of Rome had abstained from any direct attempt against the queen and the country: but from this time plots were contrived and treasons planned in rapid succession; for when one scheme was frustrated, by the vigilance of the government, another was adopted; so that the whole reign of Elizabeth, with the exception of the early portion of it, was constantly developing some machination or other, devised by the emissaries of Rome. At the head of the confederacy against the queen were the pope and the king of Spain, who hated her with the most deadly hatred,—the former, because she was the chief stay of the reformation, the

latter, because she was an obstacle to the prosecution of his designs on this country*.

The first act of rebellion was the attempt of the earls of Westmoreland and Northumberland. This was soon after the bull was issued. In all the treasons and rebellions of this reign some of the priests of Rome were more or less concerned; and these two earls were instigated to the attempt by Morton, an Englishman and a priest, who was sent into England by the pope himself, for the express purpose of stirring up rebellion. The design, however, was strangled in its birth, and its promoters paid the penalty of their lives.

In 1576, Pius V. paid the debt of nature, and was succeeded by Gregory XIII., who did not depart from the practices of his predecessor. Stukely, another subject of the queen's, was authorized to go into Ireland by his holiness; and the pope had the presumption to pretend to confer the title of marquis and earl of several places in that country. He was commissioned to stir up rebellion, the pope engaging to supply men, and the king of Spain promising supplies of money. The purpose was, however, defeated: but the next year several individuals were actually sent into Ireland, accompanied, as usual, by Sanders, a priest, who was possessed with legantine authority from his holiness. To encourage the Irish, a banner, consecrated by the pope, was sent over, and every other means was resorted to, which the most inveterate enmity could devise. The pontiff also sent them his apostolical benediction, granting to all who should fall in the attempt against the *heretics*, a plenary indulgence for all their sins,

* The gunpowder treason, and almost all other treasons in the reigns of Elizabeth and James, flowed from the doctrines which were promulgated by the papal see in the Bull of Excommunication. The Bull may be seen in the author's recent work, *The Spanish Armada*, in the Appendix.

and the same privileges as were conferred on those who fell in battle against the Turks. Sanders, however, died miserably, and the attempt completely failed.

It was about the year 1580 that the seminary priests, who were so designated from the circumstance of being trained in certain seminaries on the Continent, instituted especially for English priests, began to come over into England for the express purpose of enforcing the bull of excommunication against the queen. They assumed various disguises on their arrival, travelling from place to place to promote the grand design, which had been projected at Rome. They endeavoured to execute the bull by making various attempts upon the queen's life, from which, however, she was mercifully delivered. Two points were constantly kept in view: the one to stir up dissensions at home, among the queen's subjects; the other to induce the papal sovereigns to promise men and arms, whenever it should be deemed desirable to make a descent on the country. Many of these men were executed as traitors, though the Romanists pretend that they were martyrs for their religion*. It is true that their religious views led them into treason and rebellion; yet they were no more martyrs for their faith than the murderer who was executed at Tyburn. Parsons and Campion were the leaders of this body: the former escaped to the Continent, the latter was taken and executed for his treasonable practices.

It is constantly asserted by Roman Catholic writers, that the priests who suffered during this reign were martyrs to the faith: and the inference is attempted to be drawn,

* For a full discussion of the question, whether the priests and others who suffered death at this period and subsequently, were punished for religion or for treason, the author's work, *The State of Popery and Jesuitism in England*, may be consulted. In that work I have entered fully into the subject, and have proved that all the parties who suffered were executed for treason.

that the Church of England is as much exposed to the charge of persecution as the Church of Rome. One thing is certain, however, that, whether the advisers of Elizabeth were justified in their course or otherwise, they did not consider that they were putting men to death for religion: but, on the other hand, the martyrs under Queen Mary were committed to the flames as heretics, not as traitors or offenders against the laws of the land. When, therefore, Romanist writers attempt to draw a parallel between the martyrs of the Anglican church under Queen Mary, and the priests who suffered in the reign of Elizabeth, it is a sufficient answer to their cavils to allege the fact, that the former were put to death according to the mode prescribed in cases of heresy, which was an offence against religion; the latter were tried and executed for treason, which is an offence against the state. It is the remark of Archbishop Tillotson, that "We have found by experience that ever since the reformation they have been continually pecking at the foundations of our peace and religion; when God knows we have been so far from thirsting after their blood, that we did not so much as desire their disquiet, but in order to our own necessary safety, and indeed to theirs."

In 1583 Somerville attempted to kill the queen. The plot was discovered, and its author only escaped a public execution by strangling himself in prison.

In 1585 another plot was revealed. Parry, who had been employed on the Continent, came into England with a fixed determination to take the life of the queen. To this act he was instigated by the pope, who sent him his benediction, with a plenary indulgence for his sins. He was discovered and condemned. On his trial he produced the pope's letter, which had been penned by one of the cardinals.

At this time, when it was found that all the plots were

secretly contrived or supported by the seminary priests, certain severe statutes were enacted. The priests, whose only occupation in England was to stir up rebellion, were commanded to quit the country, or be subjected to the charge of treason. These enactments were absolutely necessary, for almost every priest was a traitor: nor was it possible that it should have been otherwise, when the pope himself encouraged them in their designs.

During this year Sixtus V. was elected pope in the room of Gregory XIII. This pontiff walked in the steps of his immediate predecessors. It should be stated, that at that time the doctrine was inculcated, that it was meritorious to kill heretics, and those who were excommunicated. To die, therefore, in any such attempts, as those to which I have alluded, was deemed the readiest way to the crown of martyrdom, which was coveted by many members of the church of Rome. When such doctrines were believed, we cannot be surprised that so many treasons and rebellions were contrived.

In 1586 the life of the queen was attempted by Babington. The plot was discovered, and he and several of his accomplices were executed.

Thus it became necessary to frame new laws to preven the plots of the seminary priests, who flocked into England for the sole purpose of exciting rebellion. A statute was, therefore, passed, by which it was made treason for any one, who had been ordained a priest by authority of the see of Rome, since Elizabeth's accession, to come into her dominions. This act was charged with cruelty at the time, and the charge is still repeated, not only by Romanist, but by many other writers: yet the act was absolutely necessary in self-defence. It was intended to keep the priests out of the country, since their coming always issued in treason and the consequent loss of their lives. Let it be

remembered that the laws against recusants were not enacted until the treasons of Campion, Parry, and others, had rendered such a step on the part of the government unavoidable. The course adopted to prevent the coming of the priests was a merciful one, for it was supposed that they would not venture into England at the peril of their lives: it was also a reasonable one, since no sovereign was ever known to permit men to reside in his dominions who denied that he was the lawful prince, and who endeavoured to withdraw his subjects from their allegiance, or stir them up to rebellion. As early even as the reign of Edward I., to bring in a bull from Rome without the consent of the prince was adjudged to be treason*.

The next year a similar plot, which was devised by an Englishman of the name of Moody, was brought to light. All these attempts were directed against Elizabeth herself; and though Englishmen were the traitors, who engaged to carry the plots into execution, yet they were encouraged in their designs both by the pope and the king of Spain. The

* By the 27th Elizabeth, c. 2, it was enacted, "Because Jesuits, seminary priests, or other priests came over into this realm of England, of purpose, as it hath appeared by sundry of their own examinations and confessions,—not only to withdraw her highness's subjects from their due obedience, but also to stir up and move sedition, rebellion, and open hostility—to the utter ruin, desolation, and overthrow of the whole realm, if the same be not the sooner by some good means foreseen and prevented, that it shall not be lawful for any Jesuit, seminary priest, or other such priest - being born within this realm—ordained by any authority derived from the see of Rome, to come into, be, or remain in, any part of this realm: and if he do, that then every such offence shall be taken and adjudged to be high treason, and every person so offending shall for his offence be adjudged a traitor." This statute was rendered necessary by the treasonable practices of the priests. Had they not been engaged in such practices, the statute never would have been devised. The only way, in which it can be said, that such priests suffered for religion is this, namely, *that their religion led them into treason;* but this would be to charge all their sufferings upon the church of Rome herself, which is indeed the fact, though Romanists will not admit it.

intention of the papal party was to dethrone Elizabeth, and seat Mary, queen of Scots, on the throne. No one will justify Elizabeth in taking the life of Mary: but it may be observed that if no attempts had been made against her own life, and if the court of Rome had acted justly and honourably, the ministers of Elizabeth would never have recommended the execution of that unfortunate queen. Her death must be attributed to Romish principles, and to the papal attacks on the Protestant religion*.

The year 1588 is memorable in English history for the defeat of the *Spanish Armada*, impiously called the *Invincible Armada*. Several years were occupied in its preparation: and the enemies of England expected to overwhelm the country by one stroke. At this time the pope revived the bull against the queen, in which it was pretended that she was deprived of her royal dignity and kingdom, while her subjects were absolved from their allegiance. The attempt was frustrated by the providence of God, and the church and the country were mercifully saved.

What the intentions of the Romanists were, may be gathered from Dr. Sharp's statement to the army, after the defeat of the *Armada*. One of the prisoners made a confession, the particulars of which the doctor was commanded to make known to the troops†. In those days, there were no *newspapers;* nor was it then so easy to communicate intelligence by *placards* or *bills*. We find, therefore, that the pulpit was often made a vehicle for publish-

* At this time Cardinal Allen, an Englishman, published a defence of Stanley's treason, maintaining that in consequence of the queen's excommunication and heresy, it was not only lawful, but a duty to deprive her of the kingdom.

† Sharp's statement and other particulars connected with the *Armada*, are detailed in a recent work of the author's, entitled *The Spanish Armada*, A.D. 1588. Parker, London.

ing the common news of the day. At a subsequent period, during the commotions between Charles I. and his Parliament, when the latter obtained possession of most of the pulpits, they were the only channels through which many of the people were made acquainted with the progress of the war. Whatever had occurred during the week was published to the people, from the pulpit, on the Sunday*.

In 1590, Urban VII. became pope. He was succeeded in a very brief space by Gregory XIV., who also was speedily succeeded by Innocent IX. Nor did Innocent occupy the papal chair for any lengthened period. In consequence of the defeat of the *Armada*, and also of the rapid changes in the holy see, three popes having died within the space of eighteen months, there was a slight cessation from the attempts against Elizabeth. In 1592, Clement VIII. was elevated to the popedom: and under his auspices there was a revival of the previous practices, which had not been renounced, but merely relinquished for a season. During several succeeding years, certain persons were commissioned by the court of Rome to raise rebellions in England, and to poison or assassinate the queen. The watchful eye of providence, however, was extended over the country and the queen. Every plot was discovered; every hostile design failed; and the only sufferers were the traitors themselves.

Patrick Cullen received absolution and the sacrament, A.D. 1592, from the Jesuit Holt, by whom it was determined to be a meritorious deed to kill the queen; and, in 1594, Williams and York came over to England for the same purpose, having first received the sacrament in the

* For a description of the proceedings of the Parliamentary divines in publishing the *news* of the day from the pulpits during the civil war, the reader is referred to my former work, *A History of the English Episcopacy from* 1640 *to* 1660.

Jesuits' college. In the year 1597, Squire was sent from Spain with the same object in view, namely, the assassination of the queen; he also was instigated by Walpole, a *Jesuit*, from whom he received the sacrament. It was observed by Sir Edward Coke, that since the Jesuits set foot in England, there never passed four years without a pernicious treason: and history proves that the assertion was correct.

About this time the English fleet obtained a most decisive victory over the Spanish: and in 1598, Philip of Spain, the great enemy of England, was removed by death from that scene, in which he had, for so many years, acted so conspicuous, yet inglorious a part.

In 1599 and 1600, a rebellion was headed in Ireland by Tir Owen. This rebel chief, was, as usual, encouraged by the pope, who sent him a plume of feathers as a token of his favour.

In 1603 the queen died in peace. Never, perhaps, in the history of the world was a sovereign delivered from more conspiracies than Queen Elizabeth. The efforts of her enemies were unceasingly directed to one object, and that object was the queen's death. Not only were private individuals instigated to attempt her destruction, but the most extensive confederacies were entered into by almost all the papal sovereigns of Europe.

From the preceding abstract it will appear, that from the year 1570 to 1600, Queen Elizabeth and the Protestant religion were constantly exposed to the machinations of the active partisans of the Roman see, who were encouraged by the pope himself. Every pontiff pursued the same course. There was a settled purpose at Rome, and, indeed, throughout the whole Romish confederacy, to dethrone Elizabeth and overturn the Anglican church; nor is it a libel on the church of Rome to say, that in all these

proceedings, she acted on recognised principles—principles which had received the solemn sanction of her councils. To root out heresy, by any means within their reach, was deemed, or at all events was asserted, to be a sacred duty incumbent on all the members of the church of Rome. The doctrine may be denied in the present day, when times and circumstances do not permit of its being carried into practice; but, unquestionably, it was not merely believed as an article of faith in the days of Elizabeth, for we have seen that attempts were constantly made to enforce the bull of Pius V.*

James I. succeeded to the throne at a period when the eyes of Romanists were fastened on England as their prey. A conspiracy was in agitation before the death of Elizabeth; and the confessions and examinations of the Gunpowder conspirators show that a plot was partly contrived before James's accession. Some of their number went into Spain to stir up the Spanish court against the queen, and to request a foreign army for the subjugation of England. The death of Elizabeth took place while those proceedings were going forward on the Continent, and thus the operations of the conspirators were suspended for a season. As soon as James's accession was known, the king of Spain endeavoured to enter into a negociation for peace, so that the conspirators were not at this time openly favoured by that monarch, who imagined that some concessions might be obtained from James in favour of his Roman Catholic subjects. Unquestionably the Romanist party in England endeavoured to induce the king of Spain to attempt an invasion of the country: and it is equally certain, that their solicitations would have been taken into serious consideration if Queen Elizabeth had not died.

* For many particulars connected with the preceding treasons, I refer the reader to CAMDEN'S *Elizabeth;* CARLETON'S *Thankful Remembrance;* BARLOW'S *Gunpowder Treason.*

On the accession of James, therefore, there was a calm: but it was deceptive: it was only the calm before the storm; and to the eye of the careful observer, it indicated anything but prosperity and tranquillity. It was evident to most men of reflection, that the storm was gathering: nay, there were indications of its approach, though no one knew how or where it would burst forth. The rolling of the thunder was, as it were, heard in the distance, though whether it would approach nearer or pass away altogether, was a question which no one could determine.

King James took quiet possession of the throne, though many plans were devised for the purpose of preventing any but a Papist from succeeding Queen Elizabeth. On the death of the queen, James was proclaimed, and received as the undoubted heir to the crown. But as soon almost as he had taken possession of his new dignities, a very singular treason was set on foot, in which persons of opposite religious views were implicated. Some of the parties were Protestants: others were Romanists. Among the former were Sir Walter Raleigh, and the lords Grey and Cobham; and among the latter, two missionary priests, Watson and Clarke. Of course these parties had different objects in view, though they united together in one plot. The Protestants were discontented with the proceedings of the court, and wished to awe the king into a change of measures; the priests wished to obtain a toleration of their religion. It was arranged that the king's person should be seized, and that he should be confined until they had obtained their ends. The conspirators were tried and condemned: and Watson and Clarke, with one of the laymen, were executed.

Watson was a secular priest and a decided enemy to the Jesuits. Some time before, he had written two works in which the Jesuits are very roughly treated. According to his own confession, he was anxious to have the co-ope-

ration of some of the Jesuits in this particular plot. They, however, declined, alleging as a reason, that they had another plot of their own, and that the two could not be carried on together. This confession will merit some further notice, in a subsequent chapter, in discussing the question of the Jesuit's participation in the Gunpowder Treason.

I have now glanced at the various treasons which were practised against Queen Elizabeth: and also at the principles from which they flowed, namely, the principles of the church of Rome respecting the punishment of heresy, and the keeping faith with heretics. The doctrine of the church of Rome on these subjects, as expounded by the Jesuits, and especially by Parsons, who at this period was one of the prime movers of every conspiracy against the English sovereign, was this, namely, that if any prince should turn aside from the church of Rome, he would forfeit his royal power; and that this result would follow from the law itself, both human and divine, even before any sentence was passed upon him by the supreme pastor or judge. This doctrine was a consequence of the papal supremacy. The doctrine of the supremacy is this—that the bishops of Rome, as successors of St. Peter, have authority, derived to them from Christ himself, over all churches, and kingdoms, and princes; that, in consequence of this power, they may depose kings and absolve their subjects from their allegiance, bestowing the kingdom of the offender on another; that excommunicated princes are not to be obeyed; and that to rise in arms against them, or to put them to death, is not only lawful, but meritorious. Acting on these principles, Clement VIII. issued certain bulls, in which he called upon all members of the church of Rome to use their exertions for the purpose of preventing the accession of James, on the death of Queen Elizabeth.

Under such circumstances was James I. called to the

throne. The papal party were resolved on the execution of their designs: and the pope and the king of Spain were so far implicated, that they were fully aware, if not of the particular nature of the intended plot, yet that certain schemes would be resorted to for the accomplishment of the grand object, which was the subjugation of England to the papal yoke. Had the conspirators been successful, they would have been furnished with all necessary supplies for their purpose by the court of Rome, and those states which were in alliance with the holy see. Such a combination could not have been defeated by human means; but the watchful eye of divine providence was fixed on the country, and the designs of its enemies, as will be shown in this narrative, were mercifully frustrated. The bulls above alluded to were to be kept secret as long as the queen survived. They were addressed to the clergy, the nobility, and the commons, who were exhorted not to receive any sovereign whose accession would not be agreeable to the pope. The reasons assigned by his holiness for recommending such a course, were the honour of God, the restoration of the true religion, and the salvation of immortal souls. The Cardinal D'Ossat, to whom they were at first entrusted, wrote to King James on the subject, expressing a hope that he would openly profess the religion of his mother. It will be seen, in a subsequent chapter, that these bulls were committed to Garnet, who confessed that they had been in his possession, and by whom they were destroyed when it was found to be impossible to prevent James from succeeding to the English throne.

King James, therefore, succeeded to the English crown at a period when the pope and the papal sovereigns entertained the most sanguine hopes of re-establishing popery in this country, and when numbers of Jesuits and their disciples were ready to execute any treason which might be concocted.

CHAPTER II.

SKETCHES OF THE CONSPIRATORS.

The persons actually engaged in this atrocious deed were few in number: at the outset, indeed, very few: but the design was gradually revealed to others, though even when the discovery actually took place, the number was comparatively small. That there was a general belief among the Romanist body, that some great and effective blow would be struck, is a fact which I need not attempt to prove, since it is so well known, that no doubt can be entertained on the subject: but how the design was to be carried into effect was a secret to the great body of the Roman Catholics. The conspirators were thirteen in number. Their names were as follows:—

Robert Catesby,	Everard Digby, Knt.,
Robert Winter,	Ambrose Rookwood,
Thomas Percy,	Francis Tresham,
Thomas Winter,	John Grant,
John Wright,	Robert Keys,
Christopher Wright,	Guy Fawkes,

And Bates, the servant of Catesby.

Of this number, five only were engaged in the plot at its commencement, the rest being associated with them during its progress. Several of them took no active part in the mine; they were, however, in the secret, and furnished part of the money necessary to carry on the work. Three Jesuits, as will appear in the narrative, were also privy to the design, and counselled and encouraged the conspirators. I shall place before the reader some few particulars respect-

ing the conspirators before I enter upon the narrative of the plot.

Robert Catesby.

Catesby was the contriver of the conspiracy. In his youth he was entirely devoted to dissipation; and on his father's death he quitted the Romish church, but in 1598 he was again reconciled, and became a most zealous partizan. He was a native of Leicestershire: a man of family and property, and of such persuasive eloquence, that he induced several of the conspirators to comply, who otherwise, in all probability, would not have been implicated in the treason. Some of them admitted, that it was not so much their conviction of the justice of the cause that led them to engage in the business, as the wily eloquence of Catesby. He was descended from the celebrated minister of Richard III. Little, however, is known of him beyond the part which he acted in the Gunpowder Treason. A bigot to the principles of the church of Rome, he was a fit instrument for the execution of any plot, however horrible. Whether he was influenced by the Jesuits, or whether prompted to undertake the deed by his own feelings, is a question of no easy solution, since, in consequence of his death at Holbeach, no confession was given to the world, which would probably have been the case, if he had been brought to trial with the other conspirators. He was the only layman with whom the Jesuit Garnet would confer on the subject of the plot.

Thomas Percy.

This gentleman was nearly allied to the Earl of Northumberland, by whom he was elevated to the post of captain of the gentleman pensioners. He appears to have been a man of great violence of temper; and his conduct

proves him to have been a staunch bigot to popery. Catesby on some occasions found it necessary to restrain his violence, lest his indiscretion should mar the whole contrivance. On one occasion he offered to rush into the presence-chamber, and kill the king. He was killed with Catesby, at Holbeach, shortly after the discovery of the treason. Percy, however, had once been a Protestant.

Thomas Winter.

It appears that Winter had contemplated a departure from England altogether, when Catesby, who had entered upon the plot, requested him to come with all speed to London. The scheme was proposed to Winter, who evinced no indisposition to enter into the plot: on the contrary, he appears to have complied, with the utmost readiness, with all Catesby's plans. Soon after this interview, he went over to the Continent to reveal the design to some influential papists, with a view to ascertaining their opinions on the subject. Winter appeared at his execution to be penitent; but no hesitation was manifested by him at the first; nor does he appear to have entertained any scruples during the progress of the conspiracy. In many respects, he appears to have been an amiable man: but such principles as are inculcated by the church of Rome, are calculated to quench all those feelings of kindliness, which naturally exist in the human heart. The breast of Thomas Winter was steeled by his principles against the kindlier emotions of our common nature. It is related of him, that he dreamt, not long before the discovery of the treason, "that he saw steeples and churches stand awry, and within those churches strange and unknown faces." When some of the conspirators were scorched by the gunpowder at Holbeach, his dream was recalled to his remembrance, and he fancied that there was

a resemblance between the faces of the persons he had seen in his dream, and those of his companions. The recollection of the dream appears to have made a strong impression on him at the period when he was taken into custody.

Robert Winter.

This gentleman was the brother of the preceding, by whom he was drawn into the conspiracy some time after the mine had been commenced. The circumstance caused some distress to Thomas Winter, who petitioned the court at his trial, that, as he had been the cause of his brother's ruin, his death might be considered as a sufficient atonement to the law for both. The particulars of his capture, with Stephen Littleton, will be noticed in a subsequent chapter.

Guido, or Guy Fawkes.

Fawkes was a soldier of fortune, who for some years was engaged in the Spanish service. Little is known of his early life, except that he was a native of the county of York, and received his education in the city of York. The writer of the *Life of Bishop Morton* informs us that the bishop and Fawkes were schoolfellows together in that city. His subsequent history to the period of the treason, is but imperfectly known. He appears to have been a bold and daring adventurer, as well as a gloomy bigot to the worst principles of popery; and was, in consequence, deemed by Catesby to be a suitable instrument for his purpose. His proceedings in the mine, as well as on the Continent, will be noticed in the prosecution of the narrative.

John Wright.

John Wright was early engaged in the plot with Catesby. It was agreed between these two individuals,

Catesby and Wright, that an oath should be administered to all who should engage in the conspiracy. The oath will be given in the narrative. John Wright was killed in the struggle with the sheriff, in Staffordshire, where most of the conspirators were taken subsequent to the discovery of the plot. Wright had been a Protestant.

Christopher Wright.

This person was the brother of the preceding, by whom he was induced to enter into the conspiracy. He appears, however, to have entered into the business with as much zeal as any of the rest. He was the first to discover the apprehension of Fawkes, on the morning of the Fifth of November. His advice was, that each conspirator should betake himself to flight in a different direction from any of his companions. Had this advice been followed, several of them would probably have succeeded in making their escape to the Continent. The conspirators, however, adopted another course, which issued in their discomfiture in Staffordshire, where Christopher Wright was also killed.

Thomas Bates.

Bates was a servant, and the only one of the conspirators who was not a gentleman. When the plot was concocting, he was servant to Catesby, the leader in the treason. Catesby observed that his actions were particularly noticed by his servant. The circumstance led him to suspect, that Bates was in some measure acquainted with their designs, or at all events, that he suspected that they had some grand scheme in agitation. In the presence, therefore, of Thomas Winter, Catesby asked him what he thought the business was, which was then in contemplation. Bates replied, that he thought they were contriving some dangerous matter, though he knew not what the particulars

were. He was again asked what he thought the business might be. He answered that he thought they intended some dangerous matter near the Parliament House, because he had been sent to take a lodging near that place. Bates was then induced to take an oath of secrecy; when the particulars were made known to him. It was then stated that he must receive the sacrament, as a pledge that he would not reveal the matter. With this view, he went to confession to *Greenway* the *Jesuit*, telling him that he was to conceal a dangerous matter, which had been revealed to him by his master, and Thomas Winter, and which he feared was unlawful. He then disclosed the whole plot to the Jesuit, desiring his counsel in the business. Greenway charged him to keep the matter strictly secret, adding, that he was engaged in a good cause, and that it was not sinful to conceal the plot. Bates then received absolution and the sacrament, in company with Catesby and Winter. Such were the means used to draw Bates into the conspiracy*.

Francis Tresham.

Tresham was also engaged in the plot during its progress. He was not one of those with whom it originated; but it was revealed to him when the parties were in want of money, to enable them to carry on their scheme. He offered to contribute 2000*l.* towards the grand object. He died in the Tower before the trial of his companions.

Ambrose Rookwood.

Rookwood was a man of fortune, and, until he became implicated in this plot, of reputation. He was not one of the original contrivers of the treason, but was drawn into it

* See *The Gunpowder Treason, &c.*, by Bishop Barlow, 1679, p. 103, 104.

by a strong affection for Catesby, who appears to have exercised over him a most extraordinary influence.

John Grant.

Grant, like Tresham and Rookwood, did not labour in the mine, but was made acquainted with the scheme after it had been concocted. Grant had married a sister of the Winters. There is still a tradition in the neighbourhood of his residence at Norbrook, that the few remaining ruins are the site of the house of one of the gunpowder conspirators. He was taken with the other conspirators in Staffordshire.

Robert Keys.

Little is known of this individual: but it appears that his circumstances had always been desperate, as well as his character. He was the son of a Protestant clergyman, his mother being a Roman Catholic. For some time before the Plot he resided in the house of Lord Mordaunt, at Turvey, in Bedfordshire, his wife assisting in the education of that nobleman's children. Such a man was, therefore, ready for any enterprise, however criminal. Fuller relates the following circumstance, which I give in his own quaint language. "A few days before the fatal blow should be given, Keies being in Tickmarsh, in Northamptonshire, at his brother-in-law's house, Mr. Gilbert Pickering, a Protestant, he suddenly whipped out his sword, and in merriment made many offers therewith at the heads, necks, and sides, of several gentlemen and ladies then in his company: it was then taken for a mere frolic, and so passed accordingly: but afterward, when the treason was discovered, such as remembered his gestures, thought he practised what he intended to do when the plot should

take effect: that is, to hack and hew, kill and destroy, all eminent persons of a different religion from himself*."

Sir Everard Digby.

This gentleman was descended from an ancient family, resident in Rutlandshire. He was introduced to the court of Elizabeth at an early period of his life; and soon after the accession of King James, was knighted by his majesty. Sir Everard was made acquainted with the plot during its progress, when the early and original conspirators found themselves in want of money. He promised to furnish 1500*l.* He was taken after the discovery and was executed in London.

Henry Garnet.

Three Jesuits, Garnet, Gerard, and Greenway, were implicated in this conspiracy: the two latter escaped, Garnet alone was taken and executed. It is remarked by Fuller, "A treason without a *Jesuit*, or one of *Jesuited principles*, therein, is like a drie wall, without either lime or mortar; Gerard must be the cement, with the sacrament of secrecie to join them together: Garnet and Tesmond, (whelps of the same litter,) commended and encouraged the designe†." Garnet received his early education in Winchester school, when Bishop Bilson was warden. It is said that he was engaged in a conspiracy among the boys, whose design was to cut off the right hand of their master. At this time Garnet was at the head of the school. He was, therefore, educated as a Protestant. His conduct in other respects seems to have been so immoral, that he was advised not to offer himself as a candidate for a scholarship at New College. He

* Fuller's *Church History*, Book x. 35.
† Book x. 34.

quitted Winchester for Rome, where he enrolled himself in the society of the Jesuits. At length he was made the superior of his English brethren, in which character he returned into England, to promote a rebellion against Queen Elizabeth. Other particulars respecting his subsequent career will appear in the narrative.

Thus have I endeavoured to give a brief sketch of the actors in this dark transaction. In reading the pages of history, we feel a natural desire to know something of the persons, whose exploits are recorded. The particulars, which I have given in this chapter, are such as could not so well have been stated in the narrative. All other matters, however, relative to any of the preceding individuals will be woven with the history, on which I am now about to enter.

The parties mentioned in the preceding sketch were the only persons, who were actually implicated in the plot by any decided acts. It is pretty evident, too, that very few persons, besides those actually engaged, were fully acquainted with the particulars of the plot. It was the policy of the conspirators to reveal the precise nature of the design to as few as possible, feeling assured that the smaller the number of actual traitors the less was the risk of discovery. They were also aware, that all, or, at all events, most of the Roman Catholics would join them, when the design was carried into execution. The *Jesuits*, who were privy to the plot, intimated to the great body of the Romanists, that some grand design was in agitation, without specifying particulars. The actual plot, therefore, was confined to a very few persons; but that a plot of some kind was going forward was believed by the great body of the Roman Catholic population throughout the country.

CHAPTER III.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONSPIRATORS, TO THE LATTER END OF OCTOBER, 1605.

ENOUGH has been detailed in the first chapter to show, that it was the aim of the Romanists, throughout the reign of Elizabeth, to assassinate the queen, and to overturn the church. On James's accession, they persisted in the same course. In tracing the origin of the powder plot it is necessary to look back to the close of the reign of Elizabeth. In December, 1601, Garnet, Catesby, and Tresham, sent Thomas Winter into Spain, with a view to obtaining assistance from the Spanish monarch against England. It was always found, in the projected invasions of England, that one of the chief difficulties was the transportation of horses. To obviate this difficulty, therefore, the Roman Catholics of England, or Winter in their name, engaged to provide 1500 or 2000 horses for the use of the Spanish troops on their landing on our shores. At this time an English Jesuit was resident in Madrid; and by this man Winter was introduced to one of the secretaries of state, by whom he was assured that the king was anxious to undertake any enterprise against England. The king of Spain further promised the sum of one hundred thousand crowns, to be devoted to this special service, and that he would endeavour to effect a landing on the shores of England during the next spring. Winter returned home at the end of the year, and communicated his intelligence to Garnet, Catesby, and Tresham*. The death of the queen took place soon after, when Christopher Wright was

* *The Gunpowder Treason*, by Bishop BARLOW, p. 91-2.

sent over into Spain by Garnet, for the purpose of conveying the intelligence, and also for the furtherance of the negotiation, which had been already entered into during the previous year. Fawkes also arrived in Spain soon after Wright. He had been sent from Brussels by Sir William Stanley and Hugh Owen, two Englishmen, who had been concerned in most of the treasons against Elizabeth.

As some of the Jesuits were concerned in all the treasons to which I have already alluded, so the gunpowder plot was managed by the same party, the actors being either Jesuits, or the disciples of Jesuits. Jesuits were their directors, their confessors, and their governors. "I never yet knew a treason without a Romish priest," said Sir Edward Coke, at the trial of the conspirators; and on Garnet's trial he declares, "Since the Jesuits set foot in this land, there never passed four years without a most pestilent and pernicious treason, tending to the subversion of the whole state." Shortly before the death of Elizabeth, and while the negotiations just mentioned were going forward in Spain, the pope, Clement VIII., addressed to the English Romanists the bulls to which I have already referred in a former chapter; by which they were instructed to oppose any one who should claim the crown after Elizabeth's death, unless he would promise not merely to tolerate the Roman Catholic faith, but to promote it by all means in his power. These bulls were to be executed, "*Quandocunque contingeret miseram illam fœminam ex hac vitâ excedere,*"—whenever it should happen that that miserable woman should depart this life*. On James's accession, therefore, many of the Romanists were tampered with by the Jesuits, and persuaded not to render obedience to his majesty, as being a heretic. They were told by the Jesuits that they ought even to submit to death rather

* Barlow, p. 101.

than obey a heretic. King James was, however, quietly seated on the throne, notwithstanding the secret practices of the Jesuits, backed as they were by the king of Spain and the pope. As it was dangerous to keep the two bulls in his possession, Garnet committed them to the flames on or soon after James's accession. Now it is altogether manifest, that the treason originated in these bulls of Pope Clement VIII.; for Catesby argued, when the lawfulness of the undertaking was discussed, and it was urged by some of the party that the pope's consent should be obtained, that if it were lawful to prevent James from possessing the throne, it was equally so to remove him though he had taken possession, and that the pontiff's consent had been already granted by the two bulls. I see not how this argument can be overturned by the Romanists; or how they can clear the rulers of their church of that day of the guilt of that dark transaction*.

The circumstances of the country, therefore, at the time of James's accession were very peculiar. The pope had issued his bulls to prevent any but a papist from succeeding Queen Elizabeth; the king of Spain had promised assistance to the English Romanists; and Garnet, with some other Jesuits, and Catesby and his companions, were resolved to execute the designs of his holiness. It was under such circumstances that the plot was contrived. The king of Spain, however, refused to contribute money or to send troops when he heard of James's accession, with whom he wished to enter into a peace, and to whom he sent commissioners for that purpose. The disappointment of their hopes in obtaining assistance from Spain, led the conspirators, Catesby, and his brethren, to devise some other means, by which their object might be obtained. Frequent meetings took place; and various plans were

* Barlow, p. 167.

considered and then relinquished. At length it was determined to undermine the parliament house, and destroy the king by means of gunpowder. It appears that Thomas Winter had some misgivings, lest the church of Rome should suffer in the estimation of the public if the plot should be defeated. Catesby replied, that the nature of the disease required a very sharp remedy. Still Winter started difficulties, which Catesby was most expert at removing. Winter's scruples were, therefore, allayed, and he entered into the project with all his energies. He had objected the difficulty of procuring a place, from which they might commence their labours for the mine; but Catesby encouraged him by proposing to make the attempt, and that, if it failed, they should desist from anything of the kind afterwards.

It seems that Catesby conceived the plan during the spring, A.D. 1603—4. Thomas Winter states that he was requested to meet him in town; where, after receiving a second letter, he found him with John Wright. At this meeting they conversed on the necessity incumbent on them of doing something for the cause of their religion and country; for these men, forsooth, professed to be patriots. Winter expressed his readiness to hazard his life in the cause; and Catesby made known his project. Thomas Winter then went to the Continent to meet Fawkes, to whom he was to make known the fact, that a plot was in agitation. They met and returned to England the following spring, when they were joined by Catesby and Wright. At this period Percy came to London, and meeting the rest said, "Shall we always, gentlemen, *talk*, and never *do* anything?" Catesby took Percy aside for a few minutes. Percy proposed to kill the king; but Catesby said, "*No*, *Tom*, thou shalt not adventure thy life to so small a purpose." Catesby, Winter, and Wright, agreed that an oath

of secrecy should be administered before the plot was fully disclosed to their companions; who, though they were all anxious to enter upon any project, however desperate, were not yet acquainted with the plan which had been devised by Catesby. Percy was informed that something was in agitation, but he was not to be informed of particulars till after the oath of secrecy had been administered.

Though Winter and Fawkes had met on the Continent, and had travelled together to England, yet the latter was not made acquainted with the particulars of the treason. He came to England with Winter, with a view to the contrivance of a plot, but of the particular scheme projected by Catesby he was ignorant, until after his return from the Continent. He was a reckless character, and ready to join in any desperate enterprise. Fawkes, in his own confession, declares, that the matter was at first broken to him in a general way by Winter. The parties were now five in number, namely, Catesby, Fawkes, Percy, Thomas Winter, and John Wright. According to agreement they all met together in a room beyond St. Clement's Inn. Here they administered an oath of secrecy to each other on a Primer. When the oath had been taken, they all went into the next room, in which was the Jesuit Gerard, from whom, after they had heard mass, they received the sacrament. Gerard was aware of the designs and intentions of the conspirators, though not perhaps of all the particulars; for he waited in the room for the express purpose of uniting them together into a common bond for treasonable purposes. As soon as these ceremonies had been passed through, Catesby, Winter, and Wright, unfolded to Percy and Fawkes the plan which had been devised, observing that the oath had been taken, in order that the plot might be concealed. Fawkes and

the rest fully approved of all that had been done, entering into the plot with the utmost alacrity. The oath was couched in the following terms:—

"You shall swear by the blessed Trinity, and by the sacrament you now purpose to receive, never to disclose, directly nor indirectly, by word or circumstance, the matter that shall be proposed to you to keep secret, nor desist from the execution thereof until the rest shall give you leave."

The next point was to secure a spot near the House of Lords, in which the mine might be commenced. During Winter's absence on the Continent, Catesby had heard that particular house adjoining the House of Lords might probably be secured. Inquiries were made on the subject, when it was discovered to be in the occupation of a person named Ferris, who rented it of one of the officers of the House of Lords, by whom some of the rooms were occasionally used for parliamentary business. Percy was despatched by Catesby on the business, and, after some difficulty, he succeeded in taking the house. Fawkes, under the name of Johnson, assumed the character of Percy's servant, the keys of the house being committed to his keeping*. They also hired another house in which Catesby sometimes lodged, in Lambeth, for the purpose of stowing away the gunpowder and the wood, previous to its being deposited in the mine. Their object, in depositing their materials on that side of the river, was to avoid detection, for they were fearful lest, by constantly entering the house in Westminster, the suspicion of some of the inhabitants might be awakened. It was at this period that Keys was admitted into the secret, and to him was com-

* The house was hired May 24th, 1604: and the original agreement is to be seen in the State Paper Office. See JARDINE'S *Criminal Trials*, vol. ii. 35.

mitted the charge of the house in Lambeth. During these proceedings the parliament was adjourned from the 7th of July, 1604, to the ensuing February: they agreed therefore to quit London for a season, intending to return sufficiently early for the completion of the work before the opening of the session. The conspirators departed about a month before Michaelmas Term, going in different directions, in order to avoid suspicion. About the beginning of the term, Fawkes and Winter met Catesby, who agreed that it was time to commence their operations. Arriving in London, they were rather staggered by the discovery, that the Scottish lords were appointed to assemble in Percy's house, to discuss the question of the union of the two kingdoms. In consequence of this occupancy, they were not able to begin the mine until the 11th of December, 1604. Late at night they entered upon the work of darkness! The powder had already been procured from Flanders, and deposited in the house at Lambeth. Not only did they provide themselves with the necessary tools for excavation, but they took in with them a stock of provisions, consisting of biscuits and baked meats, so that they might not be under the necessity of sending out to the adjoining shops for provisions, and thereby excite suspicion. "We entered," says Thomas Winter, "late at night, and we never saw any one, save only Mr. Percy's man, until Christmas eve."

Now it must be remembered, that these conspirators were quite unaccustomed to laborious employments: yet their mistaken zeal in the cause of popery induced them to apply themselves to the task with unceasing energy. They continued at their labour from the 11th of December until Christmas eve, without any intermission. At this time they had conducted the mine under an entry close to the wall of the parliament house, under-propping the earth, as

they proceeded, with wood. Christopher Wright was received into their party at this time, when the number of those who actually wrought in the mine was completed. Fawkes, as being the least known of the party, acted as sentinel to give the alarm in the event of danger. In his own confession, Fawkes acknowledges, "I stood as sentinel, to descrie any man that came near, whereof I gave them warning, and so they ceased until I gave notice again to proceed."

Thomas Winter, whose confession was very full and minute, informs us that, during the progress of the work, they held many conversations relative to the steps to be taken after the execution of the deed*. They hoped that the king and the assembled lords would fall a sacrifice in the explosion: but then there were the prince of Wales and the duke of York, and how were they to be despatched? It was supposed that the prince might attend the king, and share in the same fate: and Percy, who all along had evinced great boldness, undertook to secure the duke. Percy held an office near the court, and was acquainted with several of those who were employed in the royal household. He, therefore, undertook to enter the chamber, after the blow was struck, and, having placed others at the doors, to secure the young prince. It was also determined that the king's daughter Elizabeth, who subsequently became queen of Bohemia, and from whom the house of Hanover is descended, she being the mother of the Princess Sophia, and grandmother of George I., should be secured by some of their party in the country. The princess was, at this time, with Lord Harrington, in the county of Warwick, not very distant from Catesby's house. It was arranged, therefore, that the Roman Catholics of that neighbourhood should assemble, under the pretence of

* Barlow, 53, 54.

a hunting-match upon Dunsmore Heath, and that the princess should be seized during the confusion consequent on the explosion.

Money and horses were also necessary: and the conspirators, at this stage of their proceedings, did not neglect to make provision respecting both. These and other subjects were discussed in the intervals of relaxation from their laborious employment in the mine.

Another very important topic was also introduced during these secret conversations: it related to the lords whom they should endeavour to save from the general destruction. It was determined that they should prevent as many of the Roman Catholic lords as possible from attending the house on that occasion; but that the rest must necessarily perish with the great body of the peers.

It was also debated whether they should reveal the project to any foreign princes. A difficulty here stared them in the face, namely, that they could not enjoin secresy by a solemn oath, as they had done among themselves: nor were they certain that the continental princes would approve of their design. They had little hope from Spain, because the king was too slow in his preparations, and was ready to enter into negotiations with James: France was too near, and could not safely be trusted. Such were their views of France and Spain.

At this period parliament was again adjourned from February until the 3rd of October, 1605; on which account the conspirators ceased from their operations, intending to commence their labours sufficiently early to enable them to bring the matter to a completion, previous to the period fixed for the opening of the session. Previous to their separation, which, in order to avoid suspicion, was to continue till after the Christmas holidays, permission was granted to Catesby and Percy to reveal the secret to

such persons as they with the consent of a third member of the party, might approve of. John Grant and Robert Winter were accordingly admitted into their number. They were sworn to secrecy in the same manner as the rest, and the oath was confirmed by receiving the sacrament. Bates was admitted about the same time.

Early in the ensuing spring they removed the powder, which had been stowed in the house at Lambeth, into Percy's residence. Their labours were now resumed with redoubled energy. The foundation wall of the House of Lords was nine feet thick, so that their progress was necessarily very slow. They were obliged to chisel out the stones and the mortar; and the wall being exceedingly hard, they advanced only about a foot in a week. Before Easter they had proceeded about half way through the stone wall. While occupied in their work, they were one day suddenly alarmed by a noise, which seemed to proceed from no distant spot. The conspirators had provided themselves with weapons, intending, if they were discovered, to use them in their own defence. These weapons were now grasped by the whole party; and Fawkes was sent out in order to discover the cause of the noise. He soon returned to his companions, whose fears were banished by his report. Fawkes discovered that the sound proceeded from a cellar, which had been used for coals, and which was under the House of Lords. The coals were now selling off, the person who had rented the cellar being about to quit; and the noise, which had alarmed them, was occasioned by the removal of these coals. This cellar was most convenient for their purpose: for it was exactly under the throne. The grand object, therefore, was now to secure it. Fawkes soon ascertained that it was to be let. Percy immediately hired it, pretending that he wished to use it as a coal cellar for his adjoining house.

Thus far they appeared to prosper in their dark enterprise. The mine was now relinquished; and it was resolved to deposit the powder in the cellar. Their labours were discontinued; and all their energies were exerted in making arrangements to secure the success of their design*.

Having made this arrangement, Fawkes was employed in depositing a large quantity of powder and wood in the cellar which had recently been taken. The house was cleared of all those things which might have awakened suspicion, while everything was placed in the cellar,—a place which no one visited. Their preparations were completed in the beginning of May, 1605. The cellar was then carefully closed, certain marks having been made for the purpose of ascertaining whether the door had been opened in their absence.

They began now to contemplate making another trial of their friends on the Continent. Catesby proposed that Fawkes should go over, assigning two reasons for his absence; *first*, that he might not be seen in England for a time: and *secondly*, that he might acquaint Sir William Stanley and Mr Owen with their proceedings. It was, however, determined that the same oath of secrecy should be administered to these two gentlemen.

Fawkes quitted England about Easter. Stanley was absent from Brussels, to which place Fawkes had repaired; but he made the matter known to Owen, who cordially entered into the project. In the month of August, Fawkes again returned to England.

* "In piercing through the wall nine foot thick," says Fuller, "they erroneously conceived that they thereby hewed forth their own way to heaven. But they digged more with their *silver* in an hour, than with their *iron* in many daies; namely, when discovering a cellar hard by, they hired the same, and the pioneers saved much of their pains by the advantage thereof."—b. x. p. 35. They were led to believe, from this circumstance, that God was evidently favourable to their design.

Soon after the return of Fawkes, Catesby and Percy met in the city of Bath, for the purpose of calling in others to render pecuniary assistance agreeably to their previous determination. Hitherto Catesby had himself borne the expenses of the treasonable undertaking; but his resources were insufficient for the charge of maintaining the party, for the rent of several houses, and for the purchase of the materials with which the scheme was to be carried into effect. It was deemed necessary, therefore, that some monied persons should, in accordance with the arrangement made before their separation, be made acquainted with the design, in order that pecuniary aid might be procured. This plan was adopted, because the parties thought that several of the wealthy Romanists would be willing to contribute pecuniary aid, though they might be unwilling to disclose their names to the whole number of the conspirators.

It was at this stage of the business, that Sir Everard Digby, Francis Tresham, and Ambrose Rookwood were made acquainted with the design. Neither of these gentlemen scrupled to enter into the plot. It was a most extraordinary thing, that gentlemen, otherwise of strict integrity, should have been so influenced by their religious views, as to concur in such a treason without hesitation.

Sir Everard Digby engaged to furnish 1500*l.*, and Mr. Tresham 2000*l.*, towards the accomplishment of the object. Percy also promised to obtain as large a sum as possible from the rents of the earl of Northumberland. These gentlemen, however, never entered the mine: they were merely privy to the treason, and promoted it by rendering pecuniary assistance.

When these matters were arranged between Catesby, Percy, and Tresham, Fawkes and Thomas Winter procured some fresh powder, and placed it in the cellar, as they in-

tended it should stand for the explosion. All things being thus arranged by the conspirators, the parliament was again prorogued until the *Fifth* of November; an event which dispersed the party for a time. This third prorogation alarmed the conspirators, who imagined that their plot was discovered. To ascertain whether their suspicions were well founded, Thomas Winter, who was a retainer in the family of Lord Monteagle, one of the commissioners, was present at the ceremony, in order that he might ascertain whether there was any cause for alarm. He was satisfied that their suspicions were groundless, for the commissioners conversed together in their usual manner; so that they went into the country in high spirits*. About ten days previous to the *Fifth* of November, Catesby and Fawkes returned to the neighbourhood of London. Several of the traitors met together soon after at *White Webbs*, on *Enfield Chase*. At this time, they were informed, that the prince of Wales would not be present at the opening of parliament: whereupon, they determined on seizing him after the explosion. The duke of York, afterwards Charles I., was so safely guarded, that they entertained but slight hopes of getting him into their power. Down to the end of October, therefore, all things seemed to favour the designs of the conspirators, while the intended victims were unconscious of the danger to which they were exposed. Still the watchful eye of Divine providence was fixed upon the king and the peers; and the schemes of the traitors, secretly as they were carried on, were revealed, by one of those remarkable events, which no human understanding can fathom. The remark of

* "He observed," says Dr. Lingard, who refers to Greenway's MS., "that they betrayed no sign of suspicion or uneasiness: that they walked and conversed in apparent security on the very surface of the volcano prepared for their destruction. Hence it was inferred, that they must be still ignorant of its existence." LINGARD, vol. ix. 46.

Fuller on the frequent prorogation of parliament deserves attention: "As if Divine providence had given warning to these traitors (by the slow proceedings, and oft adjourning of the parliament), mean time seriously to consider, what they went about, and seasonably to desist from so damnable a design, as suspicious at last it would be ruined, which so long had been retarded. But no *taking off their wheels* will stay those *chariots* from drowning, which God hath decreed shall be swallowed in the *Red Sea**."

I have now brought down the narrative to the latter end of October, 1605. The conspirators were in and near London, Fawkes alone, as the individual who was to fire the train, taking his post in the cellar, or the adjoining house, as Catesby's servant. The parties were very cautious in all their proceedings, so that they met together secretly, whenever a meeting was necessary. As the powder and the wood were deposited in the cellar, and nothing remained to be done in London, the conspirators hovered near, leaving Fawkes to manage the firing of the train. They were full of sanguine expectations respecting the event, and busied themselves at this period, in forming plans for securing the young princes, and for carrying their ulterior designs into execution. Their designs were, however, frustrated by an overruling Providence!

* Book x. 35.

CHAPTER IV.

THE NARRATIVE CONTINUED DOWN TO THE PERIOD OF THE DISCOVERY OF THE TREASON.

The narrative has already been brought down to the autumn of 1605, when the parliament was prorogued from October to November the 5th. On Saturday evening, October 26, ten days previous to the day fixed for the opening of parliament, a letter, addressed to Lord Monteagle, was delivered, by a person unknown, to his lordship's footman, in the street, with a strict injunction to deliver it into his master's own hands. The letter was put into his lordship's hand by the servant at seven o'clock, just as he was about to sit down to supper at his house at Hoxton. On opening it, he found it to be without date or signature. Monteagle directed Ward, a gentleman in his family, to read it aloud. It was couched in the following terms:—

"My lord,

"Out of the love I bear to some of your friends, I have a care of your preservation; therefore, I would advise you, as you tender your life, to devise some excuse to shift off your attendance at this parliament; for God and man have concurred to punish the wickedness of this time. And think not slightly of this advertisement, but retire yourself into your country, where you may expect the event in safety. For though there be no appearance of any stir, *yet I say they shall receive a terrible blow this parliament, and yet they shall not see who hurts them.* This counsel is not to be contemned, because it may do you

good, and can do you no harm; *for the danger is past as soon as you have burnt the letter:* and I hope God will give you the grace to make a good use of it, to whose holy protection I commend you*."

Dark, indeed, were the words. Monteagle was, at first, disposed to treat the matter lightly; still he deemed it the safest course not to conceal its contents. Accordingly he hastened off to Whitehall, and submitted the letter to the earl of Salisbury. It does not appear that the earl laid much stress upon the letter; at the same time he expressed an opinion, that it might refer to some design of the papists, respecting which he had received information from different quarters.

Various attempts have been made to shift the odium of the conspiracy from the church of Rome, and even from any members of that church. Some Roman Catholic writers have not scrupled to say, that the whole was a trick of Cecil's, and that King James was privy to the design, which was countenanced by the court for the purpose of rendering the Romanists odious, and to pave the way for more stringent laws against recusants. Cleremond, a Spanish writer, states, soon after the discovery, that it "was a trick of state to lay it upon the Roman Catholics, when they that had a hand in the penning of the proclamation, were the chief authors and contrivers of the conspiracie." Elsewhere he says there were six or eight knights concerned in the plot, "being drawn into this hellish plot by the cunning persuasions of the Protestants themselves, as the report goeth; this is the most that can be said against them." To deny the reality of the plot was not possible. "He is bold," says an acute writer,

* "A strange letter, from a strange hand, by a strange messenger: without date to it, name at it, and (I had almost said) sense in it. A letter which, even when it was opened, was still sealed, such the affected obscurity therein."—Fuller, Book x. 26.

"not to deny the fact (for then he must have renounced his eyes, or discredited the general report that marched uncontrolled through the world*)."

No one at the time, however, questioned the reality of the conspiracy. The confessions of the parties, and the secret letters of Sir Everard Digby, preclude the possibility of even entertaining such an absurd notion. Not one of the conspirators complained of being deceived into the plot, either at his trial or execution; nor did any of their apologists deny the fact of the treason. The assertion was worthy of that church from which it proceeded. Mr. Hallam, a most unexceptionable witness, thus argues on this point: "But to deny that there was such a plot, or, which is the same thing, to throw the whole of the contrivance and management on Cecil, as has sometimes been done, argues great effrontery in those who lead, and great stupidity in those who follow. The letter to Monteagle, the discovery of the powder, the simultaneous rising in arms in Warwickshire,—are as indisputable as any facts in history. What, then, had Cecil to do with the plot, except that he hit upon the clue to the dark allusions in the letter to Monteagle, of which he was courtier enough to let the king take the credit? James's admirers have always reckoned this, as he did himself, a vast proof of sagacity: yet there seems no great acuteness in the discovery, even if it had been his own. He might have recollected the circumstances of his father's catastrophe, which would naturally put him on the scent of gunpowder†."

In recent times, however, it has been the policy of Roman Catholic writers to represent the conspiracy as the act of a few desperate characters. Desperate, indeed,

* James's *Manductio*, 128, 129.
† Hallam's *Const. Hist.*, i. 555.

they were; yet they were not men of desperate fortunes; nor had they suffered under the execution of the laws; but the sole principle that influenced them was one of religion. They were willing to risk all for the sake of promoting the interests of the church of Rome. It will also be seen hereafter that the pope, and some papal sovereigns, approved of the deed.

As to the report that the court were aware of the design long before the search, which was made in consequence of the letter, it is as destitute of foundation as the other. The court knew that some design was on foot: nor were they surprised, since such had been the case throughout the reign of Elizabeth; and the court was still composed of the same great statesmen. As to any knowledge of this particular plot, the court were not in possession of it. The king of France had informed the ministers that some secret plot was going on; but beyond this information the court had no knowledge on the subject. The secular priests, also, who were protected by Bancroft, intimated that some dark plot was concocting; but they were as ignorant of the particulars as the ministers. All the information, which James and his ministers received from the Continent, amounted merely to an assurance that a treason was hatching; but respecting the traitors and their proceedings they could learn nothing. These intimations undoubtedly rendered Cecil and James suspicious of the letter to Monteagle; but the letter conveyed the first certain intelligence that the danger was so near and so imminent.

When Cecil had read the letter, he laid it before some of his colleagues. Monteagle was anxious that it should receive every consideration. They immediately connected the letter with the intelligence respecting the designs of the papists, of which they had been previously warned.

It was determined, therefore, to submit the letter to the king, and not to take any steps in the business until they had obtained his majesty's orders.

On Thursday, October 31st, the king returned from Royston; and the next day Cecil submitted the letter to his inspection. It appears that Cecil offered no opinion concerning the letter; he merely placed it in his majesty's hands. After a little pause, the king expressed an opinion that it ought not to be despised. Cecil, perceiving that the king viewed the matter more seriously than he had anticipated, referred him to one sentence, "*for the danger is past as soon as you have burnt the letter*," which he conceived must have been written by a fool or a madman, since if the danger was past as soon as the letter was destroyed, as if burning the letter could ward off the danger, the warning was of small consequence. The king connected the expression with the former sentence, "*that they should receive a terrible blow at this parliament, and yet should not see who hurt them.*" Taking the two sentences together, the king immediately fancied that there was an allusion to some attempt by gunpowder. An insurrection, or any other attempt, during the sitting of parliament, could not be unseen; could not be momentarily executed. The king interpreted the clause thus, that the danger would be sudden and as quickly over as the burning of the paper in the fire, taking the words *as soon* in the sense of *as quickly*. He suggested, therefore, that the letter must refer to an explosion of gunpowder, and that the spot chosen for it must be under or near the House of Lords.

It is remarkable that Cecil himself had intimated to some of his colleagues, before the king's return from Royston, that the letter must refer to an explosion of gunpowder: the very same suspicion also crossed the mind of the Earl of Suffolk, the lord chamberlain. This suspicion,

however, was concealed from the king by the two statesmen. His majesty instantly took the same view of the letter, though there is no reason to believe that he was acquainted with the opinions of his two councillors. Popish authors have laboured to prove, that the treason was either planned by, or at least known to, the court, because the king so readily referred the letter to an explosion by gunpowder*. Cecil and Suffolk had conceived the same opinion, though it does not appear that they made known their sentiments to others. But what proof does this circumstance furnish of any previous knowledge even, on the part of the court, much less of contrivance? Was it strange that they should thus interpret such a mysterious letter? Cecil and Suffolk were fully aware of the plots which had been devised against Elizabeth; they knew that on more than one occasion, the traitors had contemplated the death of the queen by means of gunpowder. With these facts fresh in their recollection, it was perfectly natural to interpret the letter to signify some attempt of the same kind. In short, no other interpretation could have reasonably been put upon it. That the king himself should have suspected some attempt by means of gunpowder was also to be expected. He was well aware of the practices of the church of Rome; and it is probable that, on this occasion, he recollected the fate of his father, King Henry, whose death was accomplished by an explosion of gunpowder. To King James, therefore, really belongs the honour of discovering the gunpowder treason; for, though Cecil and Suffolk had conceived the

* In a letter from the Earl of Salisbury to Sir Edward Coke, the former suggests that something should be said in praise of Lord Monteagle, and assigns this reason, "because it is so lewdly given out that he was once of this plot of powder, and afterwards betrayed it all to me."—See the *Letter copied from the original in the State Paper Office* in JARDINE'S *Criminal Trials*, vol. ii. p. 121.

same idea, yet they do not appear to have been fully satisfied that their suspicions were well founded. Besides, the two lords did not communicate their suspicions to the king. The remarkable part of the business, therefore, is the fact, that the three individuals should have so readily struck upon the same idea. It must, however, be stated that the interpretation put by the king upon the clause relative to the burning of the letter was not the true one: for it is pretty clear, that the writer wished Monteagle to absent himself from the parliament, and to burn the letter to avoid the suspicion of being privy to the plot. But, though we may admit, that the king's interpretation of the clause was not that which the writer intended, yet we must acknowledge, that his majesty's suggestion was most providential, and sufficient to justify the strong language used in the Act of Parliament for the observance of the Fifth of November. Let it be remembered that timidity was one of James's infirmities; and fear is usually very quick-sighted*.

At this first interview with the king, no plan was

* Mr. Jardine discountenances the idea that the plot was an invention of the Earl of Salisbury's. "That Lord Salisbury, or any other member of the Government, concocted the whole scheme for political purposes, is not only incredible in itself, but is wholly unsupported by evidence, and is negatived by all the ascertained facts of the transaction."—JARDINE, vol. ii. p. 189. Such a report was, however, industriously circulated by the Romanists. "There are some Romanists would gladly have the world believe all this to be but a mere cheat, only to be a trick of Salisbury, the then secretary; and for proof, I have had the patience and pleasure to hear a story very gravely told, how one lurking under the council-table (and upon what jealousie came he there) concealed by the long carpet, heard much of the contrivance. But though this story might be false, yet will they have Cecyl to be the plotter, and to draw these Romanists into it: as if (supposing this were true) they were not guilty and traitors. Can you deny but that they themselves thought the plot lawful and just? That, accordingly, they really intended it? and would have done it, if not prevented! If Cecyl occasioned it, he must use some means and instruments: and who and what they were,

adopted for their future course. The king suggested a search; but Cecil did not give his sanction. It appears to have been his aim to delay the search a little longer; and, therefore, he quitted the royal presence with a jest. What his motives were for not complying with the king's suggestion, cannot be ascertained. In all probability he was anxious to consult his colleagues, or he may have thought that the king's apprehensions relative to the concealment of gunpowder under the House of Lords were too strong. He did not, however, think lightly of the matter, though he jested with his majesty; for he immediately laid the whole case before the lords, with whom he had previously consulted, telling them what the king had said and suggested. It was agreed that Cecil should wait on the king the next day. The next day, accordingly, being Saturday, he introduced the subject again to the notice of his majesty. At this interview the lord chancellor was also present. It was now determined, that the lord chamberlain, by virtue of his office, should examine all the parts contiguous to the House of Lords, and especially the lower offices, in order that he might judge, from the appearances, which might present themselves, whether there was a probability of any such danger. To prevent the circulation of idle rumours, as well as to allow the conspirators to carry their plans as near to completion as possible, the examination was

is a wonder that they were not discovered and known before now. Those who were executed accused nobody, and as the poet saith well

> 'He that hangs, or beats out's brains,
> The Devil's in him if he faigns.'—*Hudibras.*

If this were a cheat, known to be so, would not Father Parsons and others have vapoured with it all the world over? Would they have been silent in the matter? Or would they have concealed any thing that would have vindicated themselves and exposed and shamed the church of England?"—Foulis, p. 510-11.

deferred until the following Monday, November 4th, being the day preceding that fixed for the opening of the session.

It is remarkable that the circumstance was made known to the conspirators within a short time after the delivery of the letter to Lord Monteagle: for on Sunday evening, October the 27th, Ward, who had read it on its reception, called on Thomas Winter, to whom he stated the fact, and also that it was already in the possession of the Earl of Salisbury.

Winter communicated the intelligence to Catesby, and recommended instant flight; but the latter was determined to ascertain the exact amount of information which had been communicated to Monteagle. Winter, therefore, remained at White Webbs with Catesby, while Fawkes repaired to London to watch the proceedings of the court. Fawkes left them on Wednesday morning, October 30th, and returned in the evening, with the gratifying intelligence, that he found everything in the cellar just as he had left it. Fawkes was not informed of the circumstance of the letter until after his return. They now hoped that the letter was disregarded, and that the danger of discovery was over. Tresham, who was related to Monteagle's wife, was suspected of being the writer of the letter. He was absent at the time, but on his return he was questioned on the subject by Catesby. He denied, however, that he had any knowledge of the matter; and it appears from Winter's confession that his denial was believed by the other conspirators. On Saturday, November 2nd, in the evening, Tresham and Winter met again in Lincoln's Inn Fields. On this occasion, Tresham related several particulars of the interviews between the king and Cecil, and expressed his conviction that the cellar was known to the

council. How he became acquainted with these particulars does not appear. Both Catesby and Winter deemed it necessary now to think of flight; but the former would not take that step without seeing Percy, who was not yet come up from the country. On Percy's arrival on the Sunday, he recommended that they should remain, and await the issue. They agreed, therefore, to wait till the next day. On the Sunday they heard from Ward that the letter had been submitted to the king. It was now settled that Catesby and John Wright should leave London on Monday to join Sir Everard Digby at Dunchurch. Percy and Thomas Winter remained in their lodgings, and Fawkes continued at his post in the cellar.

The security of the conspirators, after so many warnings, is remarkable. On the Monday evening, November 4th, they lingered in London in the hope that the cellar would not be discovered. Ambrose Rookwood stated in his confession, read at the trial, that Catesby sent for him to the house of *Little Harry*, near Clement's Inn, on Saturday, November 1st, and expressed his fears that all was discovered. But on Monday at dinner, Catesby told Rookwook that "he did not think that the secret was discovered, for one had been at the cellar, and that all things were close and well enough." The house of *Little Harry* was the place where the original conspirators met to administer the oath of secrecy to each other, and to receive the sacrament from Gerard the Jesuit.

On Monday afternoon, agreeably to the previous arrangement, the lord chamberlain, accompanied by Lord Monteagle, and Whinyard, keeper of the wardrobe, proceeded to examine the rooms under the House of Lords. They came at last, to the vault or cellar, which had been taken by Percy. Here they saw the coals and wood which had been deposited there by the conspirators, to

conceal the barrels of gunpowder. The cellar was at the disposal of Whinyard: and it appears to have been his privilege to let it for his own profit. On being questioned by the lord chamberlain, Whinyard replied, that he had let the cellar to Thomas Percy, with the adjoining house, and that the wood and coals were the property of that gentleman. At this stage of the examination, the lord chamberlain saw a man standing in a corner of the cellar, who stated that he was Percy's servant, and that he was left by his master in charge of the house and cellar. This individual was Guy Fawkes, who was appointed to fire the train. The lord chamberlain carelessly remarked to Fawkes, that his master was well provided, by his large stock of fuel, against the blasts of winter. On leaving the cellar, Lord Monteagle intimated his suspicion that Percy who was his friend was the writer of the letter. This suspicion entered his mind as soon as Percy's name was mentioned*. Neither the writer nor the bearer of the letter, however, was ever known: but by the interposition of Divine providence, one, who was solicitous of preserving the life of an individual nobleman, became the instrument in the discovery of the plot, and of bringing destruction on all the conspirators.

The lord chamberlain returned immediately to the king, to whom, with the council, he related all that he had seen, mentioning also the suspicion of Lord Monteagle respecting

* The following passage from *The Continuation of the History of England from Sir James Mackintosh*, in *Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia*, will show how unqualified the continuator is for the task which he has undertaken: "Search was accordingly made, and the powder was found concealed under billets of wood and fagots: but all was left in the same state as before, to lull the conspirators into security." Now at the search to which this writer refers, the gunpowder was not discovered. The parties returned to the council, and having made their report, it was debated whether the search should be carried further; and it was at the second search that the gunpowder was discovered.

Percy. He expressed his surprise that so large a quantity of fuel should be deposited in the cellar, when it was well known that the house was seldom occupied by Percy. It appears, too, that he did not consider that the appearance of Fawkes was much like that of a servant. Fawkes communicated all the particulars of the search to Percy, and then returned to his post in the cellar.

The king still insisted, that it was necessary to make a more rigid search, and that the wood and coals must be removed. It occurred to him, that they were placed there to conceal the gunpowder: for it was his majesty's firm conviction, that some such attempt was alluded to by the writer of the letter. The members of the council who were then present, concurred also in the same opinion. Still they were in doubt as to the mode in which the search should be conducted. They were, on the one hand, anxious for the safety of the king's person, and on the other, fearful lest, if nothing of the kind should be discovered, they might be exposed to ridicule for entertaining groundless fears, unbecoming in statesmen and the ministers of the crown. It was suggested, also, that if the search proved fruitless, the Earl of Northumberland might feel himself aggrieved, in consequence of his relationship to Percy, the owner of the house. All the members of the council agreed in the necessity of instituting a search; but their opinions respecting the manner in which it should be effected widely differed. James insisted, that they must necessarily adopt one of two courses; either search the cellar narrowly, or leave the matter altogether, and go to the House the next day, just as if no suspicion had ever existed.

It was therefore determined at length, that a search should be made; but to prevent any sinister report, supposing nothing was discovered, it was ordered that Whin-

yard, the keeper of the wardrobe, should search the cellar, under the pretence of having lost some of the hangings, which had been placed in his custody. The king also suggested that the search should be conducted under the direction of a magistrate. Accordingly, Sir Thomas Knivett, a magistrate for Westminster, proceeded with a small and chosen band, to the parliament house, at midnight; while the king and his councillors remained at Whitehall. At the entrance to the cellar, they discovered Fawkes standing with his cloak and boots on, as if about to take a journey. He had just made all his arrangements within, when the magistrate and his party approached. Knivett apprehended him immediately, and then the party proceeded to remove some of the wood and coals. They soon came to a barrel of gunpowder: and in a short space the whole number, amounting to thirty-six, were discovered. The next step was to search the prisoner Fawkes. They found on his person matches, and all other things necessary for his purpose. A dark lantern was discovered in a corner of the cellar*. Fawkes made great resistance, when the party attempted to search his person; but as soon as he was secured, he expressed his sorrow, that he had not been able to fire the train, which he asserted he would have done, if he had been within the cellar at the moment when he was taken, instead of being at the door.

* "Now to be seen in Oxford Library."—Foulis's *Romish Treasons*, 508. This lantern I have seen, as no doubt have many of my readers. It bears the following inscription: "Laterna illa ipsa quâ usus est, et cum quâ deprehensus Guido Faux, in Cryptâ Subterraneâ ubi Domo Parliamenti diffiandæ operam dabat. Ex dono Robti Heywood nuper Academiæ Procuratoris, Ap. 4, 1641." It is evident from the words just quoted from Foulis, that the lantern was in his day believed to be that of Fawkes; nor is there any reason for the contrary belief.

MILLAND

Besides the lantern and the matches, there was found on the person of Fawkes, a *pocket watch!* At that time, such a thing was very uncommon. He had procured this watch in order that he might ascertain the exact hour for firing the train. Such little incidental notices serve to show the state of the arts and sciences at particular periods, with their subsequent progress, better than the most laboured treatises on the subject. At this time, we learn, that small watches for the pocket were very uncommon; for the fact, that such a watch was found on the person of Fawkes, is mentioned as a rare circumstance. What a contrast between that period and the present day! And yet, in many of the fine arts, the age of James I. and Charles I. vastly excelled our own. In the mechanical arts, however, it was greatly inferior.

Sir Thomas Knivett, having secured Fawkes, returned to Whitehall, about four o'clock on the morning of Tuesday, the Fifth of November, so that the discovery took place exactly twelve hours before the time, when the train would have been fired, if the parliament had assembled. The magistrate communicated everything to the lord chamberlain, who rushed without ceremony, into the king's chamber, exclaiming that all was discovered, that all was safe, and that the traitor was secured. All the members of the council, who were in London, were now summoned to attend. Within a short space, Fawkes was placed before them, in order that he might be examined respecting this unheard-of treason. The prisoner appeared before them undaunted. Neither the awful situation in which he stood, nor the numberless questions which were put to him by those who stood by, moved him in the least. He not only avowed his participation in the treason, but regretted that he had not been able to execute it. Alluding to the discovery, he remarked, that the Devil, not God, was the author of

that discovery. During the whole day, the council could extract nothing from him by their examinations. He took all the blame upon himself, refusing to name any of his accomplices, but acknowledging that he was induced to enter upon the treason, from religious motives alone. He denied that the king was his lawful sovereign, inasmuch as he was a heretic. At this time, he refused to disclose his true name, calling himself *John Johnson*, servant to *Thomas Percy*. Thus was discovered, one of the darkest treasons with which our annals are stained. Divine providence interposed, just at the moment when the conspirators believed that their expectations were about to be realized. The merit of the discovery must certainly be attributed to the king. For though it is clear that the letter evidently pointed to something of the sort; yet before the treason was discovered, most of those to whom it was submitted, were in much doubt as to its meaning. The king alone suggested, that the vaults under the house should be searched; and in such a case, who can deny, that the thought in the king's mind was suggested by a higher power? "Let King James," says Fuller, "by reading the letter, have the credit of discovering this plot to the world, and God the glory, for discovering it unto King James*." Wilson's words are much to the same effect; "being discovered by a light from heaven, and a letter from one of the conspirators, when the fire was already in their hands, as well as raged in their hearts, to put to the train†."

Half an hour before the time, when it was expected that the king would enter the house, Fawkes was to place a match in such a position, that after burning during that space, it should fire the train. He was to set sail for Flanders, for the purpose of obtaining succours from foreign

* Fuller, b. x., p. 37. † Wilson's *James I.*

princes: and the rest of the conspirators were to manage matters at home. It is said that those Jesuits who were privy to the design, but who could not publicly appear, were appointed to meet on a certain spot, on Hampstead Hill, that they might behold the conflagration caused by the explosion. This spot is still designated *Traitors' Hill.*

There is, indeed, a story, which would lead to the belief, that Fawkes was to have been sacrificed by his brethren in crime. I give the story, as it is recorded in the histories of the period, without pledging myself to its truth. At Tickmarsh, in Northamptonshire, resided a Mr. Pickering, who had a horse remarkable for its speed; Keys, one of the conspirators, is said to have borrowed this horse, shortly before the period fixed for the opening of the session. Fawkes, after having fired the train, was to proceed to St. George's Fields, where he would find the horse in question, on which he was to make his escape. This was the impression on Fawkes's own mind. It was further arranged, that Mr. Pickering, who was a well known puritan, should that morning be murdered in his bed, and secretly conveyed away; and that Fawkes also should be murdered in St. George's Fields, and so mangled, as not to be recognised by any one. A report was then to be circulated, that the puritans had perpetrated the atrocious deed; and to give some colour to this report, the conspirators were to appeal to the fact, that Mr. Pickering, with his swift horse, was there ready to escape; but that some persons who saw him, in detestation of so horrible a deed, had killed him on the spot, and hewed his body in pieces. Thus the mangled body of Fawkes was to be taken for that of Mr. Pickering, it being supposed that no one would doubt the fact, from the circumstance of the horse being found near the spot. It is added, that Fawkes, when he

was convinced that it was the intention of his companions to have put him to death, confessed the whole plot, which he would not have done, but for this treachery on the part of his fellow-conspirators. Such is the story, but I cannot vouch for its truth*.

That there was an attempt to cast the odium of the treason on the Puritans, is an undoubted fact. Sir Charles Cornwallis, the English ambassador in Spain, writing to Lord Salisbury, details the particulars of a conversation between Cresswell, the Jesuit, and himself. Cresswell labours to exculpate the members of his church: and after lamenting the deed, he remarks that it "was the error of the Puritans, that in case of their princes becoming of contrary religion, it was lawful to take away their lives†." Cresswell could not deny that the treason was a Popish one, but he insinuated that it was quite consistent with the views of the Puritans. Sir Thomas Edmonds, the English ambassador in the Low Countries, in a letter from Brussels, dated December 27th, 1605, addressed to Sir Charles Cornwallis, states that he could not make the parties, with whom he conversed, believe in the conspiracy, and that sometimes they asserted it to be an *artifice of the Puritans*, and at other times, *a design* of the *Hollanders*. "Here," says an author of the period, "I draw a double observation, one of the wily *Spaniard*, who, knowing that his majestie and the state was justly incensed against the *Puritants*,

* "To carry on which false report, they had framed a *Proclamation* which they had got printed, and ready for publishing, upon the sign given, which they supprest, and burnt upon the discovery, though some of them by chance came to view, and were seen and read by Dr. Parker, dean of Lincoln, Sir W. Ellis, recorder of the said city, and other persons."—Foulis's *Romish Treasons*, p. 508. For the above story, see Samuel Clark's *England's Remembrancer*, 12mo. 1677, p. 101-102. The Proclamation is mentioned by Sir Everard Digby.

† Winwood, ii. 179, 183. Fuller, b. x. 34.

cast all the envie they can upon them: the fall of the house in the Blackfriars was upon the *Puritants*. The king was, or should have been deposed by the *Puritants:* the powder treason should have been wrought and brought to passe by *Protestant Puritants*. The other observation is this, that there is no report so hellish or incredible, but a Romanist or Hispianiolized Papist will soon believe it, if it be told him *in ordine ad Deum*, or to make the king of Spain, their master, master of the land*."

The fact, that the vaults and cellars under the House of Lords were then let out to hire for such purposes, furnishes a singular view of the manners of the age when contrasted with those of our own times. It appears that the inferior officers of the house made the most of their privileges. At this stage of the discovery, the king and his ministers were ignorant of the mine, which had been carried along from Percy's residence, under the walls of the House of Lords. This was not known until some of the conspirators had made a confession of all their proceedings. Great was the joy of the nation when it became known that such a treason had been brought to light, and great was their gratitude to that omniscient Being, by whose gracious interposition, the dark designs of the conspirators were defeated†.

* James's *Manductio unto Divinitie*, 4to. 1625, p. 129.

† In addition to what has been stated in this chapter respecting the Earl of Salisbury's knowledge of the plot, I may mention that several schemes were concocted on the Continent with a view to taking his life, not, however, because he contrived the plot, but because he was one of the instruments by whom it was discovered. See Winwood, vol. ii. p. 230, 236, 264.

CHAPTER V.

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONSPIRATORS ON THE DISCOVERY OF THE PLOT—THEIR CAPTURE AT HOLBEACH—THE MEETING OF PARLIAMENT.

It will now be necessary to look back a little on the movements of the other conspirators. Catesby and John Wright quitted London on Monday afternoon, November 4th, as soon as Fawkes had informed them of the visit of the lord chamberlain. Fawkes remained to fire the train, and was secured, as is detailed in the last chapter. On Tuesday morning, November 5th, as early as five o'clock, Christopher Wright called on Thomas Winter, assuring him that the whole plot was discovered. Wright stated, that a nobleman had called on Lord Monteagle, bidding him rise to accompany him to the Earl of Northumberland's, where it was probably expected that Percy would be found. This was only an hour after the return of the searching party to Whitehall. Some of the conspirators were on the watch in various parts of the town; and Wright chanced to obtain the important information, which he communicated to Winter. He heard the nobleman, who called up Lord Monteagle, say, *The matter is discovered.* At Winter's request, Wright went back to Essex gate to learn something further: in a short space he returned, adding, *All is lost.* Winter was conscious that they were seeking for Percy; and he requested Wright to make him acquainted with all that had taken place, in order that he might effect his escape. Winter then quitted his lodging, being determined to ascertain the worst. He went first

to the court gates, which were so guarded that no one could enter: he proceeded onward towards the parliament house, but was prevented from passing by the guard, which was posted in King Street. As he came back he heard a person in the street observe to another, that a treason was just discovered, in which the king and the lords were to have been blown up by gunpowder. Winter was now convinced that all was discovered, and therefore he rode off into the country*.

London was all in commotion as the day dawned: the streets were thronged with spectators, all eagerly inquiring what had taken place during the night. It was soon ascertained, that a conspiracy had been providentially discovered, and that one of the traitors was already in custody. The satisfaction of the people was great at the intelligence, that no danger now existed, and that the king and the parliament were safe.

Percy and Christopher Wright left London on hearing of the seizure of Fawkes. Rookwood and Keys remained a little longer. Going out early on November 5th, they found soldiers posted in the streets. They therefore quitted town, Rookwood at eleven o'clock, and Keys somewhat earlier. Rookwood overtook Catesby, John Wright, Percy, and Christopher Wright, on the road, and the five proceeded together to Ashby St. Legers.

The conspirators had agreed to meet at Dunchurch after the explosion. Their object was to assemble large numbers of people under the pretence of *hunting*, and then seize upon the Princess Elizabeth. Having the princess in their possession, they hoped to be able to succeed in effecting a complete change in the government of the

* All these particulars are mentioned by Winter himself, in his letter to the court, which was read on the trial.—See BARLOW, *58, 59.*

country. Had the plot succeeded in London, most of the Papists would doubtless have joined them.

On Tuesday morning, November 5th, Sir Everard Digby and others proceeded, according to the arrangement, to Dunchurch. Robert Winter left them and went to Ashby St. Legers, where Catesby was expected. Just as they were sitting down to supper, at six o'clock, with Lady Catesby, the five conspirators arrived. Rookwood had quitted London at eleven o'clock, after all was discovered, and he reached Ashby, a distance of eighty miles, by six o'clock the same evening*.

The question now agitated related to their future movements; and it was determined to make an attempt at open rebellion. For this purpose they all rode off to Dunchurch, where they found a large party assembled. This attempt shows the desperate character of the men; for they could not reasonably indulge in the expectation of success. They accordingly mustered as many forces as they were able, intending to await the issue of an encounter with the civil power, and hoping, amid the confusion consequent upon the discovery of the treason, to induce many members of the church of Rome to join them. In one of the letters of Sir Everard Digby, referred to in a subsequent page, a clear and succinct account of their intended movements is given:—"If the design had taken place, there could have been no doubt of other success; for that night, before any other could have brought the news, we should have known it by Mr. Catesby, who should have proclaimed the heir apparent at Charing-cross as he came out of town: to

* The arrival of Catesby is thus related by Robert Winter: "As I was there, about six of the clock, Catesby sent for me into the fields, hard by the Town's end, and willed me to take my horse, and come and speak to him, but that I should not let his mother know of his being there. So I went to him, who told me that Mr. Fawkes was taken, and the whole plot discovered."—JARDINE, ii. 145.

which purpose there was a proclamation drawn: if the duke had not been in the house then, there was a certain way laid for the possessing him; but in regard of the assurance, they should have been there, therefore the greatest of our business stood in the possessing the Lady Elizabeth, who lying within eight miles of Dunchurch, we would have easily surprised before the knowledge of any doubt—this was the cause of my being there." They mustered to the number of eighty or a hundred persons. They quitted Dunchurch by ten o'clock the same night, Tuesday, November the fifth, for Norbrook, the residence of John Grant. At Warwick they seized upon a number of horses in the middle of the night, leaving their own in their room. From this place they proceeded to Huddington in Worcestershire, the residence of Robert Winter, which they reached at two o'clock on Wednesday the sixth of November.

William Handy, servant to Sir Everard Digby, was examined on the trial, and communicated the particulars respecting the proceedings of the conspirators in the country. Sir Everard had told the servant to prepare his horse for hunting at Dunchurch on the fifth of November. On that day Handy met his master, at the inn at that village, with several other gentlemen, who having quitted the place, arrived at Warwick at three o'clock in the morning. Handy states that they were about thirty in number on arriving at Grant's house. On the way he heard one of the Wrights say, "That if they had had good luck they had made those in the parliament house fly with their heels upwards to the sky."

A remarkable circumstance took place at Robert Winter's house on the Thursday morning. Handy states that all the company, servants as well as others, received the sacrament at three o'clock in the morning, and were con-

fessed by a priest. Absolution follows upon confession—so that these men, some of whom had just quitted London, and all of whom were more or less implicated in the plot, were absolved by a priest of the church of Rome. This is confirmed by Robert Winter, who says in his letter: "I confess that on Thursday the seventh of November, I did confess myself to Hammond the Jesuit, as other gentlemen did, and was absolved, and received the sacrament*."

As they passed through the country, they seized upon such arms and ammunition as fell in their way. On Thursday morning they proceeded to Whewell Grange, and having seized the arms, they reached the house of Stephen Littleton, at Holbeach, in Staffordshire, the same evening. The sheriff of Worcestershire having arrived at Holbeach on Friday, November the eighth, at noon, commanded them to surrender, thinking that they were merely guilty of an ordinary riot, for he had not yet heard of the conspiracy. In those days intelligence was not so rapidly communicated, from one part of the country to another, as in modern times. The discovery took place on Tuesday morning very early: and the assemblage at Littleton's house was on the Friday after; and yet the sheriff of Worcestershire had received no information respecting the discovery of the plot. The traitors, however, were not aware that the sheriff was ignorant of their proceedings in London: on the contrary, they imagined that he was sent after them by a special order from the court. They prepared, therefore, to defend themselves, being resolved to sell their lives as dearly as possible.

The sheriff promised to intercede with his majesty in their favour, on the condition of their surrendering themselves, being unacquainted with their treason. Several

* Jardine; also Barlow, p. 105.

proclamations had been sent into the country after the conspirators, in which the necessity of preserving Percy alive was strongly urged. But in those days a hundred miles were not, except on very particular occasions, soon travelled over*. It is stated by contemporary authorities that the roads were very bad at the time; while another reason assigned for the slow travelling of the messengers, who had carried the proclamations, is the shortness of the days. It appears that travelling by night at that time was rarely contemplated. Thomas Winter quitted London after Catesby and Percy: but he did not overtake them on the road. He joined the party on Wednesday at his brother's house, and proceeded with them to Littleton's residence. Sir Everard Digby left Holbeach with the intention, as he says, of hastening some succours. He was overtaken near Dudley, and conveyed to London with the other conspirators.

While they were occupied in making their preparations in the house, a spark of fire dropped on about two pounds of gunpowder, which had been laid on a plate near the chimney, for the purpose of being dried. One of the party chanced to throw a log of wood on the fire; this raised the sparks, one of which fell on the powder, causing an explosion, by which the roof of the house was blown off, and the persons of Catesby, Rookwood, and Grant blackened and scorched. It was remarkable that a bag of gunpowder, of considerable size, which was lying in the room at the time of the explosion, was blown into the court-yard without being ignited, or none of the conspirators could

* On some occasions, however, intelligence was rapidly conveyed. It has been seen that Rookwood travelled eighty miles on the fifth of November between *eleven* and *six* o'clock. From Cecil's letter to Sir Charles Cornwallis, we find that the capture of the conspirators was known in London on the ninth of November, the day on which the letter is dated.—See WINWOOD, vol. ii. p. 173.

have survived, and thus the whole of the plot would have been for ever enveloped in mystery. Catesby, Rookwood, and Grant were partly disabled by the explosion, "so bearing in their bodies," says Fuller, "not στιγματα, *the marks* of the *Lord Jesus Christ*, but the print of their own impieties." As the house had caught fire, it was deemed necessary to open the doors and attempt to escape; but when the bars of the outer gates were removed to permit the conspirators to rush forth, the sheriff's men rushed in, so that escape was impossible. The battle now raged in the court-yard of the house with great violence. Catesby and Percy placed themselves back to back, and fought, though the former had been partly disabled by the explosion, with desperate courage. One of the sheriff's men levelled his piece across a wall, taking deliberate aim at Catesby and Percy, both of whom fell by the same ball, the former dead on the spot, and the latter mortally wounded*. The two Wrights also were slain, during the encounter in the court of Littleton's house: Rookwood and Thomas Winter were wounded; and the rest with the exception of Robert Winter were taken prisoners. Keys was taken the same day in Warwickshire, on his way to join the rebels, and was sent to Sir Richard Walsh, the sheriff of Worcestershire. Bates escaped from Holbeach on the morning of the capture: but he was taken a few days after.

As soon as possible after the struggle, the conspirators were lodged by the sheriff in the county goal. In a short space they were removed to London: and during the

* "Never," says Fuller, "were two bad men's deaths more generally lamented of all good men: only on this account, that they lived no longer to be forced to a further discovery of their secret associates."—Book x. 36. The name of the individual who fired the shot was John Streete; and a pension of two shillings a day was awarded to him by his majesty for this service.

journey, and especially as they approached the metropolis, the people came in vast crowds to obtain a sight of men, who had concocted and almost executed so desperate a treason. Every one wished to see the faces of men, whose names and whose deeds were now resounded from one end of the country to the other.

Tresham remained in London during the commotion consequent upon the discovery of the plot. He was taken on the 12th of November, and lodged in the Tower on the 15th. Tresham was examined several times before the council, and confessed that he knew of the plot from Catesby, about the 15th of October, and that he was anxious to defeat it. This confession, the suspicions of the conspirators, and various other circumstances seem to connect Tresham with the discovery*.

Robert Winter and Stephen Littleton escaped before the sheriff had surrounded the house. They wandered up and down the country during the space of two months; but were at last taken in a most singular manner. A contemporary narrative of their adventures still exists among the Harleian MSS., copious extracts from which are given by Mr. Jardine. For some time they remained in a barn belonging to a farmer in Staffordshire, one of Humphrey Littleton's tenants. They were compelled to quit this place by the farmer's imprudence. They secreted themselves in various places, leaving them when instructed to do so by Humphrey Littleton. On New-year's day, they called at a farmer's of the name of Perkes, who knew them. There they concealed themselves in a mow of barley in a barn. Perkes had been warrener to Mrs. Littleton, by whom he had been dismissed for some improper conduct: and he was still in the habit of going out at night with a companion of the name of Poynter, and stealing

* See *Extracts from State Papers,* in JARDINE, ii. 99.

that lady's rabbits. On one occasion, after they had returned from the warren late at night, both of them being partly intoxicated, Poynter repaired to Perkes's barn, instead of going to his own house. Climbing up on the mow, he fell down into the hole in which Winter and Littleton were concealed. They were not willing that Poynter should leave the place, lest he should betray them: so they kept him with them four days. Perkes's servants, who were in their master's secret, brought food daily to Winter and Littleton; and Poynter having injured his leg, begged them to bring him some salve for the purpose of applying it to the wound. Having received the salve, he got on the top of the mow to be near the light; and creeping nearer and nearer to the outside, he at last slipped down, and escaped from the barn before Winter and Littleton could secure him. They were afraid to follow him; but supposing that Perkes would find the means of keeping him quiet, they still continued in their hiding place.

On the day of Poynter's escape, Mrs. Littleton, who had no knowledge of the treason, started for London, with the view of answering any question which might be put to her. Humphrey Littleton, taking advantage of his cousin's absence, and being aware of Poynter's escape, brought the two traitors from the barn into Hagley House, revealing the matter to one person only, John Fynes, or Fynwood, who had been in his own service, and was now in that of Mrs. Littleton. Being now in better quarters, Robert Winter said to the cook, "Ah, Jack, little thinketh thy mistress what guests are now in her house, that in so long a space did never so much as look upon a fire!" Humphrey Littleton had assured them that the man might be depended on. It was late at night, and, wanting beer with their supper, the cook suggested, as the butler was in bed, and it would not be safe to call him up,

that he should go into the town to his mother's, who kept a public-house. The cook revealed the secret to his mother. In the morning he also informed Mr. Hazlewood, the steward, who gave directions to the parties who came for the purpose of searching the house, and who, it appears, had been sent by the cook's mother. Winter and Littleton attempted to escape, under Humphrey Littleton's directions, by a back door; but they were almost immediately apprehended. They were sent off to London, and lodged in the Tower with the rest of the conspirators.

On the 9th of November the Parliament assembled. The king addressed them on the occasion in a lengthened speech, in which he dwelt on the proceedings of the traitors, and on the policy of the measures which had been enacted against recusants. James took a sort of review of all the dangers to which he had been exposed, alluding especially to the Gowry conspiracy. The speech abounds in good sense, and sensible and judicious remarks are scattered over all its parts. Alluding to the characters of the conspirators, he very wisely observes, that there was nothing to induce them to enter into this conspiracy, except a mistaken zeal for their religion. He tells the lords and commons, that as soon as the letter was shown to him, he interpreted certain expressions, contrary to the ordinary laws of grammar, to refer to some explosion of gunpowder. Having heard the speech from the throne, the parliament was adjourned until the 21st of the ensuing January.

When the discovery of the plot was known on the Continent, several of the sovereigns sent to congratulate the king on his escape. In the case of some of these sovereigns, their congratulations were sincere; but in other cases the language of deceit must have been used. The king of Spain and the pope were among the most forward

to congratulate his majesty; and yet with great inconsistency they sheltered and protected some of those individuals who fled from their own country, and were privy to the conspiracy. Osborn tells us, however, that the pope could not refrain from laughing in the face of one of the cardinals, when he informed him, that the Spanish monarch had sent a special messenger to the English court for the express purpose of congratulating king James on his escape. Indeed, all these congratulations were hollow and insincere; but the Pontiff and the King of Spain would have been exposed to censure, if they had not so far acted the part of hypocrites as to pretend to rejoice at the escape of the English monarch.

That the pope and the king of Spain, and some other papal sovereigns, would have rejoiced at the success of the plot, can scarcely be doubted, since their subsequent actions, as will be noticed in another chapter, proved that they favoured those who were privy to the conspiracy. It can scarcely indeed be doubted that the Spanish sovereign, and his holiness, and perhaps some other sovereigns, though they were not aware of the particulars of the plot, knew that some conspiracy was in agitation, which was intended to be executed during that winter. Many of the Romanists on the Continent knew that some great deed was to be attempted, though they did not know the particulars.

The parliament did not meet on the 5th of November, but the following entry stands on the journals of the House of Commons under that date:—"This last night the upper house of parliament was searched by Sir Thomas Knevett; and one *Johnson*, servant to Mr. Thomas Percye, was there apprehended, who had placed thirty-six barrels of gunpowder in the vault under the house, with a purpose to blow up the king and the whole company when they should

there assemble. Afterwards, divers other gentlemen were discovered to be of the plot*."

On the 21st of January the two houses assembled according to the previous arrangement, when a committee was formed "to consider the laws already in force, that tend to the preservation of religion—what defects are in the execution of them, or what new laws may be thought needful†." The lord chancellor gave special directions to the clerk to notice the peers who should fail to attend in their places; for there was a suspicion that certain Roman Catholic lords were implicated in the treason. Some were in consequence imprisoned and fined. The minds of men could dwell on nothing else; nor is it surprising that such should have been the case; for a most horrible plot had been discovered, and the traitors were already in prison awaiting the sentence of the law. At length a committee was appointed to decide upon some course to be taken against *jesuits*, *seminaries*, and other *papal agents*.

The conspirators were tried and convicted at common law, as will be related in the next chapter; but the parliament seemed anxious to award some new punishment, beyond that which was ordinarily inflicted on traitors, in the case of such culprits, for the purpose of marking their sense of the crime. Accordingly a committee was appointed in the lords to consider what extraordinary punishments should be inflicted. While they were engaged in this business, it was reported to the house, that it was not convenient to delay longer the trial of the conspirators, and therefore the matter dropped. The commons were no less anxious on the subject than the lords. The question was debated at some length; but at last it was determined, that the conspirators should be left to the ordinary courts of justice. On the

* *Parl. Hist.* v. 125. † Ibid. v. 141.

25th of January, however, the commons framed and passed a bill, which was sent up to the lords, entitled, *An Act for appointing a Thanksgiving to Almighty God every year on the Fifth of November*. When the bill was carried to the lords, the messenger stated, "that the whole body of the commons having entered into consideration of the great blessing of God, in the happy preservation of his majesty and the state, from the late most dangerous treason intended to have been attempted by the instigation of *jesuits*, *seminaries*, and *Romish priests*, had framed and passed the said bill in their house, as the first fruits of their labours, in this session of parliament, which they did very earnestly recommend to their lordships." The lords read and passed the bill in three days, without even going into a committee. This act is, therefore, the *first* in the printed statutes of the session. Several bills were passed against recusants, and as a protection to the Protestant religion. On the 27th of May the session was terminated *.

It may be mentioned, that the ceremony of examining the vaults under the House of Lords was long performed at the commencement of every session. The cellar was designated Guy Fawkes's Cellar. It appears that the cellar was removed during the reign of George IV.; and thus one of the evidences of the treason is destroyed. A medal was struck at the time to commemorate the deliverance. One is preserved in the British Museum; and it

* During this session an Act was passed, by which every one was obliged to take the oath of allegiance—"a very moderate test," says Hume, "since it decided no controverted points between the two religions, and only engaged the persons who took it to abjure the pope's power of dethroning kings." Mr. Hallam's testimony is equally conclusive: "We cannot wonder that a parliament so narrowly rescued from personal destruction, endeavoured to draw the cord still tighter round these dangerous enemies. The statute passed on this occasion is by no means more harsh than might be expected." —*Const. Hist.* i. 554-5.

has been engraved by Van Loon. An able writer in *The Church of England Quarterly Review*, for January, 1840, conjectures that the medal was struck in Holland, by order of the States General, who celebrated our national deliverance by setting apart a day for public worship*.

* The following extract relates to the pursuit of the conspirators, subsequent to the meeting at Dunchurch. It is taken from a letter addressed by Lord Harrington, at whose house the Princess Elizabeth was residing at the time, to his relation Sir John Harrington, of Kelston, near Bath. It furnishes an illustration of the commotion into which the country was thrown by the discovery of the Plot. It is dated January 6, 1606-7. "The late devilish conspiracy did much disturb this part. The King hath got at much truth from the mouths of the crew themselves. One hath confessed that he had many meetings at Bathe about this hellish design: you will do his majesty unspeakable kindness to watch in your neighbourhood, and give such intelligence as may furnish inquiry." He says, "I have seen some of the chief, and think they bear an evil mark in their foreheads, for more terrible countenances never were looked upon. His Majesty did some time desire to see these men, but said, he felt himself sorely appalled at the thought, and so forbare. I went with Sir Fulke Greville to alarm the neighbourhood, and surprise the villains, who came to Holbeach; was out five days in peril of death, in fear for the great charge I had left at home. Wynter hath confessed their desire to surprise the Princess at my house, if their wickedness had taken place at London."—See *Nugæ Antiquæ*, i. 372-373.

CHAPTER VI.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CONSPIRATORS.

Fawkes was repeatedly examined after his capture. For some time he persisted in the refusal to reveal the names of his accomplices: on the 7th of November a letter addressed to himself was found on his person, when he admitted that Johnson was an assumed name, and that his real name was *Guido Fawkes*. On the 8th of November he made a full confession of all the particulars of the conspiracy, suppressing only the names of the actors. On the 9th, the intelligence arrived in London of the capture of the conspirators at Holbeach, and then it appears that Fawkes made known the names of the parties in the plot.

The conspirators who were taken at Holbeach were brought to London about the middle of November, and were subjected to repeated examinations. They acknowledged that they were guilty of the treason charged against them; and several of the particulars, which I have detailed in the preceding chapters, were revealed in their confessions. Catesby and Percy were slain at Holbeach, or some other information respecting the origin of the plot might have been obtained.

Tresham, as before observed, died in prison, and was thus spared the ignominy of a public execution. The other conspirators, Robert Winter, Thomas Winter, Guy Fawkes, John Grant, Ambrose Rookwood, Robert Keys, and Thomas Bates, were arraigned and placed at the bar on the 27th of January, 1605-6. The names of Garnet, Greenway, and Gerard, all jesuits, were also specified in the indictment, though none of them were taken. Garnet was subsequently apprehended; but the other two jesuits evaded the pursuit

of the officers of justice altogether. The jesuits are specially charged in the indictment with persuading the other conspirators to act, on the ground that the king was a heretic, and that all heretics were accursed and excommunicated; and that, consequently, it was lawful, nay, even meritorious, to kill the king, for the advancement of the see of Rome. The seven individuals before mentioned are then charged with the contrivance of the plot, in conjunction with the jesuits. When the usual questions were asked, they all pleaded Not Guilty.

The indictment was opened by Sir Edward Phillips, one of the king's sergeants-at-law. This gentleman stated the case to the jury in a speech partly political and partly theological. Treason was the subject, but, said he, "of such horror, and monstrous nature, that before now, the tongue of man never delivered, the ear of man never heard, the heart of man never conceited, nor the malice of hellish or earthly devil ever practised." In the course of his speech he further stated, that the object of the traitors was "to deprive the king of his crown; to murder the king, the queen, and the prince; to stir up rebellion and sedition in the kingdom; to bring a miserable destruction upon the subjects; to change, alter, and subvert the religion here established; to ruinate the state of the commonwealth, and to bring in strangers to invade." That such were their objects is a matter of certainty.

Sir Edward Coke, the attorney-general, followed in a long speech, in which he stated, and then animadverted on, all their proceedings, from the commencement of the plot until its discovery. "Surely," said Sir Edward, "of these things we may truly say, *Nunquam ante dies nostros talia acciderunt*, neither hath the eye of man seen, nor the ear of man heard, the like things to these."

The particulars recorded in the preceding chapters were

many of them taken from the confessions of some of the conspirators; and the speech of the attorney-general was founded, in a great measure, on the same confessions. Several days had been occupied in examining the parties in prison; so that the law officers of the crown came to the trial amply prepared with materials. In tracing the progress of the treason, Sir Edward remarked, "It had three roots, all planted and watered by jesuits and English Roman Catholics: the first root in *England*, in *December* and *March;* the second in *Flanders*, in *June;* the third in *Spain*, in *July*. In England it had two branches; one in *December* was twelve months before the death of the late queen, of blessed memory; another in *March*, wherein she died." He then specifies some of the acts in which Garnet and others were concerned, previous to the accession of James, and which have already been detailed in a preceding chapter.

Some important particulars are stated in the speech of Sir Edward Coke, respecting the conduct of the government towards the papists, after James's accession. During the reign of Elizabeth, severe measures were never adopted against *recusants*, as Roman Catholics were then usually designated in acts of parliament, until their own conduct, or at all events, the conduct of some members of the church of Rome, rendered such measures absolutely necessary. James was disposed to act with all possible leniency. Cruelty was foreign to his nature. Had the Romanists remained quiet, none would have been punished. Nay, so leniently did James act, even after the discovery of the gunpowder treason, that the puritans hesitated not to charge him with leaning towards popery.

The question relative to the penal laws is clearly and forcibly stated by Sir Edward Coke: "Concerning those laws, which they so calumniate as unjust, it shall in a few

PEOPLE'S PALACE, NOT TO BE TAKEN AWAY, LIBRARY

words plainly appear, that they were of the greatest, both of moderation and equity, that ever were any; for from the year I. Eliz. unto XI. all papists came to our church and service without scruple. I myself have seen *Cornewallis*, *Beddingfield*, and others at church. So that then, for the space of ten years, they made no conscience nor doubt to communicate with us in prayer; but when once the bull of Pope *Pius Quintus* was come and published, wherein the queen was accursed and deposed, and her subjects discharged of their obedience and oath, yea, cursed if they did obey her: then did they all forthwith refrain from church, then would they have no more society with us in prayer. So that recusancy in them is not for religion, but in an acknowledgment of the pope's power, and a plain manifestation what their judgment is concerning the right of the prince in respect of regal power and place." This is the true state of the case respecting the laws against recusants. Sir Edward Coke specifies various treasons during the queen's reign, and then adds: "*Anno* XXIII. *Eliz.* after so many years' sufferance, there were laws made against recusants and seditious books." He then alludes to the coming over of the *seminary priests*, who were Englishmen, educated and ordained on the Continent, and who came over into this country for the express purpose of stirring up rebellion, and to bring over the queen's subjects to the see of Rome. "Then," says he, "XXVII. *Eliz.* a law was made, that it should be treason for any, (not to be a priest and an Englishman, born the queen's natural subjects,) but for any being so born her subject, and made a Romish priest, to come into her dominions, to infect any her loyal subjects with their treasonable practices; yet so, that it concerned only such as were made priests sithence her majesty came to the crown, and not before."

"Concerning the execution of these laws," he adds, "it is to be observed likewise, that whereas in the quinquencey of Queen Mary, there were cruelly put to death about three hundred persons for religion: in all her majesty's time, by the space of forty-four years and upwards, there were for treasonable practices executed in all not *thirty priests*, nor above five receivers and harbourers of them; *and for religion not any one.*" He proceeds: "Now, against the usurped power of the see of *Rome*, we have of former times about *thirteen* several acts of parliament, so that the crown and king of *England* is no ways to be drawn under the government of any foreign power whatsoever*." This is an important point. It was no new thing in England to enact laws against the papal jurisdiction. The words of King James himself are very strong: "I do constantly maintain, that no man, either in my time, or in the late queen's, ever died here for his conscience. For let him be never so devout a papist, nay, though he profess the same never so constantly, his life is in no danger by the law, if he break not out into some outward act expressly against the words of the law, or plot not some unlawful or dangerous practice or attempt; priests and popish churchmen only excepted, that receive orders beyond the seas; who for the manifold treasonable practices that they have kindled and plotted in this country, are discharged to come home again under pain of treason, after their receiving of the said orders abroad; and yet without some other guilt in them than bare home-coming, have none of them been ever put to death†." The laws regarded not their religious opinions, but their practices. Will any papist assert that the priests and others did not endeavour to

* Sir Edward Coke's Speech in Barlow.

† King James's *Works*, fol. 336.

compass the death of Elizabeth, and to exclude King James from the throne?

Sir Edward Coke remarks, that during the year and four months since James's accession, no penalty had been inflicted on any recusant. The conspirators could not, therefore, allege that they were driven to such a desperate course, by the harsh treatment which they had received. The plea of religion was, however, urged by these men: and that plea was especially grounded on the laws which had been enacted in the late reign against recusants. They appeared to exult in the fact, that the place in which the unjust laws, as they termed them, had been framed, would be the scene of vengeance.

When the attorney-general had finished his address to the jury, the confessions of the conspirators were read, and acknowledged by the parties. Fawkes's confession of November 25th, contained an acknowledgment that Catesby and others had endeavoured to persuade the King of Spain to invade England. The same was admitted by Tresham. Robert Winter, on the 17th January, confessed that he was made privy to the design in the manner already related. Fawkes also declared that Percy came to London on Saturday, the 2nd, to witness the action: he stated further, that he and Catesby, Percy, Thomas Winter, and the two Wrights, met on Sunday night, November 3rd, at the house behind St. Clement's Inn.

Several confessions of the conspirators were read in the court, and the parties admitted their participation in the plot. On Friday, before the trial commenced, Robert Winter and Fawkes were permitted to converse together in their cells. The former said that he and Catesby had sons, and that boys would be men, and he hoped that they would avenge the cause. They also expressed their sorrow that no one had set forth a defence or justification

of the plot, adding, "but our deaths will be a sufficient justification of it, and it is for God's cause." Fawkes admitted that such a conversation had taken place between them. The conversation was overheard and committed to writing by a person appointed for that purpose. After the evidence had been gone through, the jury were charged, and then retired to consider their verdict.

Sir Everard Digby was arraigned at the bar on a separate indictment, taken at Wellingborough. He was charged with being privy to the plot,—with having taken the oath of secrecy,—and also with open rebellion in the country with the rest of the conspirators, subsequent to the discovery. He had previously made a confession of his guilt, and, therefore, did not attempt to defend himself. As he was preparing to address the court, he was informed that he must first plead either *guilty* or *not guilty*. He immediately confessed that he was guilty of the treason charged against him in the indictment. Sir Everard Digby evidently would not have been implicated in this conspiracy, but for his zeal in behalf of the church of Rome. So strong was his attachment to the papal creed, that he appears to have imagined that he should do God service by concurring with others in the destruction of heretics.

Having pleaded guilty to the charge of treason, he addressed the court respecting the motives that had induced him to enter upon such a course. He declared that neither ambition nor discontent induced him to unite with the other conspirators, but affection for Catesby the leader. He also confessed that he was influenced in his decision by religious considerations. Perceiving, as he said, that religion was in danger, he had resolved to hazard his property, and even his life, to preserve it, and to restore Romanism in this country. It appears that the Romanists were apprehensive

of more severe laws being enacted under King James than those which had been carried by the late queen. There was no ground for such an apprehension, since King James was really anxious to treat his Roman Catholic subjects with great lenity. Sir Everard also requested that his wife and children might not suffer on his account. His last request was that he might be put to death by being beheaded, and not as an ordinary traitor.

The attorney-general replied to his address in a strain not unusual in that age, but which would not be adopted in the present day against the greatest criminal. Alluding to his very natural plea for his wife and children, Coke reminded him, in an insulting and sneering tone, of his attempt to kill the king and queen with the nobility of the country, asking where his piety and affection were when this scheme was devised?

When Coke charged him with justifying the fact he denied the charge, confessing that he deserved to suffer, but that he was a petitioner for his majesty's mercy. The attorney-general replied, that, having abandoned every principle of religion and honour, he could not expect to receive any favour from his majesty.

The earl of Northampton, a Roman Catholic, also addressed the prisoner, but in a strain somewhat milder than Coke. It would shock the feelings of the present age were the judge on the bench to revile the criminal at the bar, however notorious his guilt; but at that time such a practice was common. The earl of Northampton told him, that he had only himself and his evil counsellors to thank. He also reminded him of his favour with Queen Elizabeth; and that King James was not ill disposed either towards him or the members of his church generally. When Northampton concluded, the earl of Salisbury also addressed the court.

The jury returned a verdict of guilty against the first seven prisoners. Judgment was therefore demanded by the king's sergeant on the seven prisoners, on the verdict of the jury; and on Sir Everard Digby, on his own confession. The prisoners said but little. Thomas Winter requested that his brother might be spared, as he had been implicated in the treason by his persuasion. Bates supplicated for mercy: so did Robert Winter. Grant confessed that he was guilty of a conspiracy intended, but never executed. Rookwood, at first, attempted to justify himself, but at last acknowledged that he deserved punishment.

The lord chief-justice proceeded to pronounce judgment. He first took a review of the laws which had been enacted in the reign of Elizabeth against recusants, priests, and the receivers of priests, specifying the causes which gave rise to those enactments, and demonstrating that they were necessary, mild, equal, moderate, and capable of being justified to the whole world. Sentence was then pronounced in the usual form.

Sir Everard Digby, bowing to the lords who were seated on the bench, said, "If I may but hear any of your lordships say you forgive me, I shall go more cheerfully to the gallows." The lords instantly replied, "God forgive you, and we do."

The trial took place on the Monday: and after the sentence had been passed, the prisoners were taken back to the Tower. On Thursday, January 30, 1605-6, Sir Everard Digby, Robert Winter, John Grant, and Thomas Bates, were executed at the west end of St. Paul's church. They were drawn to the place of execution on sledges. Digby said but little. He admitted, however, that his offence was an offence against the law, but not against religion. Winter only engaged in private prayer, but Grant, alluding to the treason, expressed himself satisfied with what he

had done. When pressed by a clergyman on the subject, he replied, "I am satisfied that our project was so far from being sinful, that I rely entirely upon my merits in bearing a part of that noble action as an abundant satisfaction and expiation for all sins committed by me during the rest of my life*." Bates prayed for forgiveness of God and the king, declaring that love for his master led him into the conspiracy. The next day, Friday, January 31st, the sentence of the law was carried into effect on Thomas Winter, Ambrose Rookwood, Robert Keys, and Guy Fawkes, in Old Palace-yard, Westminster, and at no great distance from the House of Lords, the scene of their recent treason. Winter evinced sorrow for his crime. Rookwood confessed his offence, and prayed for pardon, but he prayed also that the king might become a convert to the church of Rome. Keys and Fawkes said very little. The latter, however, asked forgiveness of the king for his crime.

Most of these wretched men evinced much penitence, both in prison and on the scaffold. It is remarkable that Fawkes, the most desperate of the whole number, appeared to be the most penitent at the time of his execution. They all declared their adherence to the church of Rome, dying, as they had lived, in her communion. They requested that the officers in attendance would communicate this their dying declaration to the world.

Shortly after the execution, their quarters were hung up in various parts of the city, as was the custom at that time with those who were put to death for treason. The heads of Catesby and Percy also were fixed upon the House of Lords, where they remained some years after, when Osborne wrote his *Memoirs of King James;* unless, as he intimates, they had been removed, and others substituted in their room. It was reported when he wrote, that the

* Casaubon.

heads then fixed on the House of Lords were not those of the two conspirators, but the heads of two other individuals procured, as was supposed, from some churchyard, by the friends of Catesby and Percy, and fixed upon the poles for the purpose of preventing the discovery of the theft*.

James acted with great lenity towards the families of the conspirators. By the statute respecting treason, the property of the convicted traitor is forfeited to the crown; but in the cases of these individuals the children or heirs of those who were in possession of property were permitted to enjoy it. There was nothing vindictive in James's character; and he would have spared even these conspirators, if it had been possible.

Such was the fate of men who appear to have been guiltless of any other crime, and who would not have been implicated in this horrible treason, but for the influence of those principles which the church of Rome instilled into the minds of her deluded followers†.

* Osborne's *Works*, p. 434. It is stated by Peter du Moulin that during the civil wars two heads of the traitors were removed by permission of the ruling parties. In an explanatory *note* to an engraving published just after the execution, it is stated that Percy's head was then on the house.

† "His Majesty," says Lord Harrington, "doth much meditate on this marvellous escape, and blesses God for delivering his family, and saving his kingdom, from the tryumphs of Satan, and the rage of Babylon."—*Nugæ Antiquæ*, i. 374.

CHAPTER VII.

THE JESUITS IMPLICATED.—PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THEM. APPREHENSION, TRIAL, AND EXECUTION OF GARNET.—THE MIRACLE OF THE STRAW.—HE IS DECLARED A MARTYR.

It has already been stated that certain English Jesuits, Garnet, Greenway, and Gerard, were implicated in this dark conspiracy. The actors were laymen, but the Jesuits were no less guilty. They were made acquainted with the intended treason at an early period of its progress, and they aided and encouraged the conspirators in their proceedings.

The confessions of the conspirators revealed the guilt of the Jesuits, and means were speedily adopted to secure them. These three individuals had been participators in former treasons, and it was unlikely that any project should be set on foot without their privity. On the 4th of December, Bates confessed, that he had revealed the whole plot to Greenway in confession, who assured him that the cause was good. On the 13th of January, Bates further confessed that, when the conspirators were at Norbrook, after the treason had been discovered, he was sent by Catesby to Coughton, with a letter to Garnet.

Having obtained this information, the government issued a proclamation for the apprehension of the three Jesuits. It was dated January 15, 1605-6. That the Jesuits were deeply concerned in the treason will be seen from the evidence adduced on the trial of Garnet, as well as from other circumstances.

Allusion has already been made to the treason of Watson, the secular priest, who suffered shortly after James's accession. He distinctly states, in his trial, that

the Jesuits were engaged in a plot of their own at that time. It is not indeed possible for any one, who understands their principles, to conceive that the gunpowder treason could have been concocted and carried on without their knowledge and concurrence*.

Gerard was enabled to make his escape to the continent soon after the appearance of the proclamation. Greenway quitted Hindlip Hall and went to London, where he hoped to be able to elude the search which had been instituted by the government. The hair-breadth escapes of some of these men give an air of romance to their history. While standing to read the proclamation at a corner of a street, he was closely observed by an individual who knew him. His person was accurately described in the proclamation, and the individual, who had compared his person with the description, was determined to secure him as his prisoner. He, therefore, followed him, and arrested him in the king's name.

Greenway accompanied the man till they came to an unfrequented street, when, after a struggle, he escaped, and after concealing himself for some time in Essex and Suffolk, he was enabled to flee to the Continent.

Garnet remained for a time at Coughton after the capture of the conspirators. On the 16th of December, Hall, or Oldcorne, the chaplain in the family of Mr. Abington of Hindlip Hall, near Worcester, invited him to that place for greater safety. Garnet had formerly resided in the family of Lord Vaux, whose daughter Anne attached her-

* "Dixerunt illi, sæpeque ac constanter affirmarunt, se quam sua consilia Jesuitis in Anglia tum degentibus communicassent, petiissentque ab iis, ut tam præclari scilicet incepti participes esse vellent: responsum tulisse, non posse Jesuitas illis esse adjungere; ut qui suam ipsi quoque parilem telam orsi: memorabilem in ævum technam pararent, tempore opportuno exitum habituram." —Casaubon *Epistolæ*, fol. 1709, p. 406.

self to the Jesuit. That the attachment, though a very singular one, was criminal, there is no direct proof: however, she had resided in the same house with Garnet for some years, moving with him from place to place, and she accompanied him to Hindlip.

This mansion was erected about the year 1572, by John Abington, who adhered to the party of Mary, queen of Scots. The house was built with a view to concealment, abounding in secret chambers in every part. "Abington," says Nash, "contrived many hiding holes in different parts of the building. The access to some was through the chimney; others had trap-doors. Some of these rooms on the outside have the appearance of great chimneys." The house was just suited for Garnet's purpose. Humphrey Littleton knew where Garnet was concealed; and having been condemned for harbouring Robert Winter and Stephen Littleton, as previously stated, he made known to the sheriff, in order that his own life might be spared, that some of the Jesuits were at Hindlip. A neighbouring magistrate, Sir Henry Bromley, was commanded to institute a rigid search. The house was surrounded on the 20th of January, Mr. Abington being absent. He returned in the evening, but denied all knowledge of the conspirators*.

Several secret places were discovered, the entrances to which were in the chimneys, some of the funnels at the top, which appeared to be intended for the conveying of the smoke, being used to let in air and light into the recesses. Eleven such places in all were discovered. During three days no individual was found; but on the fourth, two men made their appearance from behind the wainscoting in a gallery. They were Owen and Chambers, the servants of the Jesuits, who, during their confinement, had had only one apple between them. They would not

* Nash's *Worcestershire*, vol. i. 585.

admit that any other persons were concealed. On the eighth day an opening was discovered which led to the cell in which Garnet and Hall had secreted themselves. When they were discovered, provisions of various kinds were found; but the principal mode by which food was conveyed to them, was a quill or reed into another chimney in an adjoining room*. Garnet mentions, in a letter to Anne Vaux, which was intercepted by the lieutenant of the Tower, that they could not stand up, and that his legs were much swollen; but that, if they had had time, they could, by removing the books and furniture, have rendered the place sufficiently comfortable for a three months' residence. He states that the man who discovered them ran away, imagining that they would fire at him†.

The prisoners arrived in London on the 12th of February, and on the following day were examined by the Privy Council. Anne Vaux, accompanied by Mrs. Abington, followed Garnet to London, and soon after she was committed to the Tower. During ten days he was subjected to repeated examinations; but he refused to acknowledge his participation in the plot. Owen and Chambers were also examined, yet little was elicited: the former destroyed himself in the Tower.

Garnet and Oldcorne were placed in cells, which were so constructed that, by removing a door, they would be able to converse together. They were made acquainted with this circumstance by a keeper, who, to induce the belief that he was acting from kindness to the prisoners, enjoined the strictest secrecy. Two persons, the one a magistrate, and the other the secretary of Lord Salisbury,

* Nash, i. 586-7.

† Hindlip Hall, the place of Garnet's concealment, was pulled down some years ago by the owner of the property, a Roman Catholic, and thus another evidence of the treason has been destroyed. There is an engraving of the Hall in Nash's *Worcestershire*.

placed themselves between the cells, so that they could hear the conversations between the two prisoners.

The conversations, as will presently be seen, were produced on the trial. Garnet had denied any knowledge of the plot until the receipt of the letter at Coughton, which had been conveyed to him by Bates on the 6th of November; but in conversation with Hall, he acknowledged a previous acquaintance with the proceedings of the conspirators.

These conversations were taken down in writing. They were mentioned to the prisoners, who denied that any such conversations had taken place. Oldcorne first admitted that they had met together in the prison; but Garnet persisted in a denial. "He denied," says the earl of Salisbury, "on his soul*;" but at last, when he perceived that it was useless to deny the fact, he admitted that Oldcorne's statement, which had been committed to writing, was correct. During his examinations, other admissions were made by the prisoner, all of which were produced at the trial.

There is no evidence that the torture was applied to Garnet, though some popish writers positively affirm that he was placed on the rack. Mr. Jardine indeed states, that it is clear that the torture was never applied†. In Garnet's case, craft was employed, and not the torture‡. The man who was appointed as his keeper, and who arranged the meetings between him and Oldcorne, insinu-

* Barlow, 195.

† Jardine, ii. 213. See Casaubon for all the particulars, p. 413.

‡ "Never any *rack*," says Fuller, "was used on Garnet, except a *wit-rack*, wherewith he was worsted, and this cunning archer outshot in his own bow. For being in prison with *Father Oldcorne*, alias *Hall*, they were put into an *equivocating room* (as I may term it), which pretended nothing but privacy, yet had a reservation of some invisible persons within it, ear-witnesses to all the passages betwixt them."

ated himself so far into his affections, by pretending to deplore the condition of the Romanists in consequence of the laws against recusants, that Garnet actually conceived the hope of making a convert of this individual. Believing that the keeper might be depended on, he committed certain letters to his care, which, instead of being sent to the parties for whom they were intended, were conveyed to the lieutenant of the Tower. These letters were produced against him on his trial.

On Friday, March 28th, 1605-6, Garnet was brought to trial at the Guildhall, in the city of London, before the lord mayor, certain of the judges, and the members of the council. The indictment was read, in which the prisoner was charged with a knowledge of the plot. The jury having been sworn, the prisoner pleaded not guilty. Vast numbers of persons attended to witness the trial; and the king himself was in the hall, in a place where he could hear the proceedings, but where he could not be seen by the people*. The trial continued from nine o'clock in the morning until seven in the evening.

As the trial of Garnet reflects so much light on the whole of the conspiracy, I shall enter into some details respecting the evidence which was adduced.

Sir John Croke, the king's sergeant-at-law, opened the case to the jury; after which Sir Edward Coke, the attorney-general, entered on all the circumstances of the treason. Sir Edward treated the prisoner with great respect. Many particulars respecting the prisoner were stated by Sir Edward in the course of his lengthened speech. Garnet came over into England in the year 1586, from which period he had been actively engaged in promoting treason and rebellion†. Those particular attempts on the life of Queen Elizabeth, to which I have directed attention in the

* Winwood, ii. 206. † Ibid. ii. 205.

first chapter, were specified by Sir Edward for the purpose of showing that the Jesuits were implicated in all the treasons of that reign. The trial, he remarked, was but a latter act of that dismal tragedy, called the Powder Treason, for which several had already suffered. "I will call it," said he, "'the Jesuits' Treason,' as belonging to them, both *ex congruo et condigno*. They were the proprietaries, plotters, and procurers of it." When it was found that the bull could not easily be executed against Elizabeth, Pius V., by whom it had been issued, and Gregory XIII., granted a dispensation to the English Romanists, by which they were permitted to obey the queen until they were able to execute the bull. The dispensation was granted; "but," says the attorney-general, "with these cautious limitations—first, *rebus sic stantibus*, things so standing as they did; second, *donec publica bulla executio fieri posset;* that is to say, they might grow into strength until they were able to give the queen a mate, that the public execution of the said bull might take place*." After an enumeration of the treasons against Queen Elizabeth, Sir Edward observes, "and now, sithence the coming of great King James, there have not passed—I will not say four years, but not four, nay, not two months—without some treason†."

He met the objection that no Jesuit was concerned in the plot, or he would have been brought to trial earlier, by stating that the delay arose from the numerous examinations which the prisoner had undergone, being twenty-six in number, commencing on the 13th of February, and ending on the 26th of March, two days only before the trial commenced. He states his belief, that Catesby revealed

* On the accession of King James, Garnet took out a general pardon for all treasons previously committed. This pardon was granted by the king to all who applied for it.

† Barlow, 153.

all the particulars of the plot to Garnet at the period when it was first conceived, remarking, that the former alleged that he "was resolved, by good authority, that the cause was justifiable." According to Sir Edward Coke, Greenway revealed all to Garnet in June, 1604, "and being informed," adds Sir Edward, "that the discourse would be too long to repeat kneeling, he announced that he would consult with him of it in confession, walking; and so, accordingly, in an ambulatory confession, he at large discoursed with him of the whole plot of the powder treason; and Garnet hath confessed, that in this conference, Greenway told him that a protector, after the blow given, should be chosen out of such of the nobility as should be warned and preserved*." Bates's confession to Greenway is mentioned with the latter's reply, "that it was for a good cause, and that he might and ought to conceal it as committed unto him in secret by his master, but that it was no offence at all, but justifiable and good." It seems that Garnet wrote to Rome in the previous August, requesting that the Pope might command the Romanists in England to remain quiet; and Sir Edward alleges that this was a trick intended to lull the country into a false security, in order that the plot might take effect. In October, Garnet met some of the conspirators at Coughton, and on the 1st of November used the prayer which will be mentioned in a subsequent page. At the end of October, the letter was delivered to Monteagle, which led to the discovery of the treason. All these particulars, with the subsequent proceedings of the conspirators, until their capture at Holbeach, are glanced at by Sir Edward Coke in his speech, which he terms "matters precedent and concurrent." He then proceeds to what he designates "matters consequent," charging treason and blasphemy upon Garnet.

* Barlow, 169.

With regard to the latter crime, the attorney-general says; "For he having liberty in the Tower to write, and sending a letter to an acquaintance of his in the Gatehouse, there was nothing therein to be seen but ordinary matter, and requests for certain necessaries; but in the margin, which he made very great and spacious, and underneath where there remained clear paper, he wrote cunningly with the juice of an orange, or of a lemon, to publish his innocency, and there denieth those things which before he had freely and voluntarily confessed; and said, that for the Spanish treason, he was freed by his majesty's pardon: and as for the Powder Treason, he hoped for want of proof against him to avoid that well enough; but concludeth blasphemously, applying the words which were spoken of our blessed Saviour to himself in this damnable treason, and saith, "*Necesse est ut homo* moriatur pro populo*."

The attorney-general alludes to the question of *equivocation*, as maintained by the Jesuits, of which mention will be made hereafter. The doctrine of deposing of princes is also stated, and with great force and truth; and in the close of the speech there is an allusion to the wonderful providence of God in the discovery. The Parliament met on the 19th of March, 1603, in the first year of King James, and sat until the 7th of July, 1604, when it was prorogued until the 7th of the ensuing February, a space of seven months. From the 7th of February it was further prorogued till the 3rd of October, and then to the 5th of November.

At the close of the attorney-general's address, the proofs of the several treasons against Queen Elizabeth, in which the Jesuits were implicated, from the year 1592 to her death, were adduced in the court. Three several examinations of Fawkes, taken on the 25th and the 30th

* Barlow, 173-4.

of November, and one of Tresham's on the 29th of November, were then read to prove that Garnet and Greenway were concerned in Winter's treasonable journey to Spain in the year before Queen Elizabeth's death. This fact was clearly proved. Several extracts were also read from Garnet's own confessions on the same point. On the 20th of February he acknowledged that he had told some of the conspirators that the "bulls of excommunication had been dispensed with till time served to put them in execution." Portions of the conversations between him and Hall were also submitted to the court, in which Garnet admitted his connexion with the earlier treasons.

After these extracts had been read, the evidence against the prisoner on the Gunpowder Treason was produced. In the first place, some of his own confessions were read, in one of which, dated the 14th of March, he acknowledges that Catesby told him at Midsummer twelvemonth, that there was a plot in hand against the king and the state. He adds, that he dissuaded Catesby, who expressed his conviction that it was lawful, and used the argument already alluded to, that as it was lawful by the bull of the pope, "to have kept the king out, it was as lawful now to put him out." In another examination, he confessed that Greenway revealed to him Catesby's purpose, "a little before St. James's tide last."

An extract from an examination of Rookwood, on the 2nd of December, was also read, in which the prisoner states, that Catesby informed him of the plot about ten weeks before, and that on his expressing his amazement, and asking how such as were friends should be spared, Catesby replied, that "he was resolved that in conscience it might be done," and that he had asked advice whether it might be done, if it could not be accomplished without the destruction of some innocents, and that the answer was,

"that they must suffer with the rest*" We have seen that this question was put by Catesby to Garnet, though the latter asserted that he was ignorant of its application. It is clear, however, from Rookwood's confession, that Catesby had this particular plot in view; nor is it very likely that Garnet was not acquainted with this allusion. Keys confessed on the 30th of November, that Catesby assured him that it could lawfully be done, as the king was a heretic and excommunicated. In an examination on the 8th of March, Garnet also admits that he met Catesby and Percy after James's accession, on which occasion Percy proposed to kill the king, when Catesby used the expression, "No, Tom, thou shalt not adventure thyself to so small purpose. If thou will be a traitor, there is a plot to greater advantage." Now it has been seen already that Percy was made acquainted with the plot soon after this conversation, and is it probable that Garnet was ignorant of it at that time? In one of the conversations with Hall, Garnet said, "he was charged with some advice he should give in Queen Elizabeth's time, of the blowing up of the parliament house with gunpowder. Indeed, I told them at that time it was lawful, but wished them to do their best to save as many as they could that were innocents†." This was read with a view to show that such a treason had been heard of by Garnet even before King James's accession.

The pilgrimage to St. Winifred's well was a very suspicious circumstance. It took place in September, 1605. Garnet and a large number of his Romanist friends, pro-

* "The good husbandman in the Gospel," says Fuller, "permitted the *tares* to grow for the corn's sake: whereas here, by the contrary counsel of the Jesuit, the corn (so they repeated it) was to be rooted up for the tares' sake."—Book x. p. 36. See also CASAUB. p. 410.

† JARDINE'S *Criminal Trials*, vol. ii., p. 219.

ceeded from Goathurst, the residence of Sir Everard Digby, to Norbrook, the house of John Grant. They also stopped at Robert Winter's, at Huddington. The ladies walked the last portion of the distance barefoot, and the whole party remained at the well during the night. Rookwood, one of the conspirators, was present with the party. At that time it was expected that the Parliament would meet on the *third* of October.

It has been stated that Garnet was at Coughton, in Warwickshire, on the 6th of November. This, indeed, was one of the strongest points connecting him with the conspiracy; for, had he not been aware of the intentions of the traitors on the 5th of November, he would scarcely have been in the neighbourhood of Dunchurch, where the rising was to take place after the execution of the plot. Garnet felt that this fact would weigh strongly against him; therefore, in the conversation with Hall on the 25th of February, he evinces much anxiety respecting that circumstance. "There is one special thing," said he, "of which I doubted they would have taken an exact account of me: to wit, of the causes of my coming to Coughton, which, indeed, would have bred a great suspicion of the matter." Hall, in his examination of the 6th of March, confirms this point, stating that Garnet had said that he hoped that they had "no knowledge of the greatest matter that might touch him, which was concerning his coming to Coughton at that time with my lady Digby." He saw that the fact of his being at Coughton at that particular time, would afford strong presumptive proof against him.

On the 13th of January, Bates confessed that he took a letter from Sir Everard Digby from Grant's house at Norbrook, to Coughton, for Father Farmer, or Garnet, and that while he was reading the letter, Greenway came into the room. In the presence of Bates they spoke of the

defeat of the plot, and Greenway went to Robert Winter's house, where he remained with Catesby about half an hour, and then departed to Hindlip. This evidence clearly connected Garnet with the plot.

Garnet also told Hall, in the conversation already alluded to, that he had been charged with certain prayers to be said at the commencement of the Parliament. He admitted that he had used the prayers on All Hallows' Day. In another *interlocution*, as it is termed, with Hall, he said, "Perhaps they will press me with certain prayers that I made against the time of the Parliament for the good success of that business, which is indeed true. But I may answer that well, for I will say, it is true that I did doubt that, at this next Parliament, there would be more severe laws made against the Catholics, and, therefore, I made those prayers." When Hall was examined on this point, he said, in his examination on the 6th of March, that Garnet had denied having used such a prayer, though he admitted that he might have "wished Catholics to pray against that time, because we had reason to suppose that there would be made some severe laws against the Catholics." Hall further stated, however, that Garnet had requested on All Hallows' Day, those who were present, "to pray to be rid of heresy, and said a verse or two of a hymn for that day, *Gentem*, &c." He further adds, that Garnet had told him that the pope had granted an *indulgence* to all who would repeat the said verses.

Frequent allusions were made to the verses which Garnet had used. They were,—

Gentem auferte perfidam
Credentium de finibus:
Ut Christo laudes debitas
Persolvamus alacriter*

* These verses are a part of a hymn from the Breviary appointed to be used on All Saints' Day, November 1. Though in the service

Another extract from an examination of Hall distinctly connects Greenway with the plot. He confessed that Greenway came to Hindlip from Huddington, Robert Winter's house, and told Mr. Abington of the failure of the plot.

All these particulars were laid before the court from the examinations of the prisoners; after which Garnet proceeded to address himself to his defence. He began with the doctrine of *Equivocation*. He stated that the Church of Rome condemned all lying; but that an individual would not be bound to answer one who had no authority to interrogate, or do anything respecting which the party had no right to interrogate*. He then, after dwelling on the pope's authority over kings, declared that he had always abhorred the plot, and did what he could to prevent it, but that he concealed it after the manner of Christ, who commands us, "When our brother offends to reprove him, for if he do amend we have gained him."

The Earl of Northampton asked why he did not oppose the measure; and Garnet replied that "he might not do it." When Garnet had finished his address, Lockerson, one of the witnesses who had overheard the interlocutions betwixt him and Hall, appeared, and confirmed on oath the statements which had been read to the court. Garnet did not deny that the account was substantially correct. When he was asked why he had not revealed the matter to the superior of his order, he replied that "he might not

for the day they appear to have been used by Garnet, with a special reference to the plot. This is clear, from the anxiety evinced by Garnet in his interlocutions with Hall. The following is an old translation, which, though not literal, conveys the sense of the original:—

From us, this faithless people, Lord destroy,
That we due praise may give to thee with joy.

* Barlow, 184.

disclose it to any, because it was matter of secret confession*." He admitted that Greenway made known to him the plot; but when asked by the Earl of Salisbury, "Did not Catesby tell you of it?" he replied, "That, my lord, I may not tell." The Earl of Salisbury addressed the Court, and denied certain calumnies which had been uttered respecting the treatment of the prisoner. When the Earl of Salisbury appealed to him, whether he had not been kindly used, nay, whether he had not been "as well attended as a nurse child," he answered, "It is most true, my lord, I confess it†."

The Earl of Salisbury asked him, "What encouraged Catesby to proceed but your resolving him in the first proposition? What warranted Fawkes but Catesby's application of your arguments?" Garnet replied that he had no warrant "to make such application?"

The Earl of Salisbury reminded him, at this stage of the trial, of his denial of the conversation with Oldcorne. Garnet's reply was singular: "When one is asked a question, he is not bound to answer before some witnesses be produced against him." The attorney-general now replied, touching on the questions of equivocation, the pope's power, and the Powder Plot. With respect to the last, he contended that Greenway's communication could not have been in confession. When Coke had finished, Forset, a magistrate, the other witness who had overheard the conversation with Hall, came in and confirmed all that had been stated in the papers. The Earl of Nottingham asked whether, if a man confessed to him that he was about to kill the king, he must conceal it? and Garnet replied, "I must in such a case conceal it." He stated that he did all he could to prevent the plot, and went down into Warwickshire for the purpose of dissuading Catesby from the

* Barlow, 190. † Ibid, 193.

project. This assertion was met by the Earl of Salisbury, who said it was absurd, since he knew that Catesby was not to be in the country till the 6th of November, the day after the blow had been given.

Another extract was now read from one of Hall's confessions, in which he acknowledges that, when Catesby said that he began to think that he had offended God in the matter, since such results had followed, he stated, that an act was not to be condemned or justified according to the event, but for the end. He alleged the example of the eleven tribes of Israel warring with Benjamin, and being overthrown, and also the overthrow of the Cyprians by the Turks.

The case of Tresham was now brought forward by the attorney-general; and as all the circumstances connected with this individual tend so strongly to illustrate the principles of the Jesuits, I shall be somewhat particular in detailing them. In this chapter, I take up the various topics in the order in which they were produced at the trial.

It has been stated that Tresham had confessed that Garnet was privy to Winter's mission to Spain. A few days before his death, he retracted that statement in a written document; and only three hours before his death he wrote a letter, and charged his wife to deliver it to the Earl of Salisbury. He alleged that he had made the former statement to avoid *ill usage*. Not only did he deny his former statement, but he added, that he had not "seen Garnet for sixteen years*." This was his dying declaration, and it was notoriously false. It seems that his wife had been instructed to procure his recantation for the purpose of screening Garnet. After Tresham's denial had been read to the court, the declarations of Garnet and Anne Vaux

* Winwood's *Memorials*, ii, 206.

were produced. The former confessed that he had seen Tresham twice or thrice within the last few years; and the latter, that he had visited her twice or thrice since the king's accession, on which occasions Garnet was present. Anne Vaux further stated, that Garnet and Tresham had met at Erith during the previous summer. Garnet acknowledged the truth of Anne Vaux's statements. This lady further added, that Garnet and herself had actually visited Tresham in Northamptonshire at the end of the summer. The Earl of Salisbury asked Garnet, "What interpretation he made of this false testamental protestation?" To which Garnet replied, "It may be he meant to equivocate."

In another written paper, which was not read at the trial, dated the 20th of March, 1605-6, he admits that equivocation is lawful in cases where it becomes necessary to an individual for his own defence, without danger to others. As an illustration of this doctrine, he cites the following instance from *A Treatise on Equivocation*, which had been licensed by Blackwall, and of which Tresham was supposed to be the author:—"A man arrives at a certain place, and is examined on oath whether he came from London, where the plague is supposed to be raging at the time. The individual, knowing that the plague is not in London, or that there is no danger, as he only passed through it, may answer that he did not come from London." Such an answer, it was argued, would agree with the intentions of those who asked the question simply to ascertain whether their own city would be endangered by his admission. In another examination, on the 28th of April, some time after his trial, he states that, in all cases where equivocation was allowable, "it was lawful, if necessary, to confirm it by an oath." Sir Everard Digby acted on this principle, as is evident from his letters, of

which some notice will be taken in the next chapter. "Yesterday," says he, "I was before Mr. Attorney and my Lord Chief Justice, who asked me if I had taken the sacrament to keep secret the plot, as others did. I said that I had not, because I would avoid the question of at whose hands it were." In another letter he says that, if he is asked about a particular priest, he shall name him *Winscombe*, in his own mind, and then deny that he knows such a person. From whom had Sir Everard learned this monstrous doctrine? From the church and her teachers*.

The case was now closed. The jury retired, and, in a quarter of an hour, returned with a verdict of *Guilty!* Judgment was then pronounced in the usual form.

That he was implicated in the plot from a very early period, is, I think, indisputable; and after the statement of his views respecting equivocation, his denials are of little value. At first, he denied all knowledge of the plot; but when it was proved, by his own conferences with Hall, which he also for a time denied, he reluctantly admitted his guilt in not revealing the designs of the conspirators.

After his condemnation, several weeks elapsed before he was brought to execution; and during the intervening space, he was several times examined respecting the plot. Means were used to elicit from him the truth, and such means, too, as cannot be justified. He was told, for instance, that many Romanists had been scandalized by his conduct in revealing the secrets of the confessional in Greenway's case, and in acknowledging the pope's bulls. It was also intimated that Greenway was taken, and lodged in the Tower. Garnet was, of course, in great perplexity. He knew not but that he might be confronted with Greenway, and he was fearful of meeting him.

* Barlow, 246; and for the illustration of equivocation, see Casaubon, who states it at lome length, p. 411, 412.

Under the influence of such feelings, he wrote to Anne Vaux. The letter, as usual, was intercepted*. In this letter he states, "I acknowledged that Mr. Greenway only told me in confession; yet so that I might reveal it after I should be brought in question for it. I thought Mr. Greenway was beyond the seas, and that he could have no harm; but if he be here, in their fingers, I hope his charity is such that he would be content to bear part with me." He also addressed a letter to Greenway, which was intercepted by the Lieutenant of the Tower. On the 25th of April, when examined on the subject, he positively denied having written any such letter to Greenway. A few days after, the very letter was shown to him, and then he said, "that he had done nothing but that he might lawfully do." He was told that Greenway had declared that he had told him of the plot out of confession; and then he was asked whether it was so. Garnet stated that they were walking when Greenway told him, and that he considered that what he said was under the great seal of confession, though his companion might consider it under the lesser seal.

On the 13th of April, the prisoner addressed an exculpatory letter to the *Fathers and Brethren* of his order. In this letter he states that he mentioned Greenway, because he thought he had escaped; otherwise, he should have devised some other story†.

Much has been said of the seal of confession; but it does not appear that the seal would have been broken,

* The letter is in the State Paper Office, and the parts bearing on the subject are given by Mr. Jardine, *Criminal Trials*, ii. 321, 322.

† The original of this letter is not to be found. Dr. Lingard affects to consider it a forgery; but Mr. Jardine has sufficiently confuted such a notion. *Criminal Trials*, ii. 328. An extract from the letter is preserved by Casaubon, p. 408-9.

even on the principles put forth by the Romanists, by Garnet's disclosure of the plot. It is clear that the matter could not have been made known to Garnet by Greenway in the regular way of confession, because the rules enjoined in such cases were not observed; for the parties were walking. Parsons, the Jesuit, declares that nothing was proved, "but that the prisoner had received only a simple notice of that treason by such means as he could not utter by the laws of Catholic doctrine, that is to say, in confession, and this but a very few days before the discovery. He, dying for the bare concealing of that, which, by God's and the church's laws, he could not disclose, and giving no consent or co-operation to the treason itself, should have been accounted rather a *martyr* than a *traitor**." The reader will perceive that Parsons is altogether in error as to the time when Garnet became acquainted with the treason. According to his own confession, supposing that he had no knowledge of the matter beyond what was revealed to him by Greenway, he was made acquainted with it about the 26th of July, 1605.

Most Romanist writers follow Parsons in declaring that Garnet, having been informed of the treason under the seal of confession, was not at liberty to disclose it. It is very remarkable that a work was published, *Disquisitiones Magicæ*, A.D. 1600, in which the case is put, that if a confederate discovers, in confession, that he or his companions have secretly deposited gunpowder under a particular house, and that the prince will be destroyed unless it is removed, the priest may reveal it, if he take proper care not to implicate the person who makes the confession.

* *Answer to Sir Edward Coke's Reports*, 4to. 1606. Bellarmine asserts the same thing: "Why was Henry Garnet, a man incomparable for learning in all kinds and holiness of life, put to death, but because he would not reveal that which he could not with a safe conscience?"

Bishop Kennet remarks on this treatise, in his Sermon, Nov. 5, 1715, "that it appeared as if the writer had already looked into the cellar and had surveyed the powder, and had heard the confessions of the conspirators*."

It must, however, be seen that he was acquainted with the plot by other means. In his letter to the king, he confesses his guilt in not revealing his general knowledge of the treason which had been communicated to him by Catesby. We can scarcely imagine that Catesby would reveal a matter to Greenway, which he kept secret from Garnet, with whom he was in habits of the most familiar intimacy. On the 29th of October, he was at Coughton; at that time he had a full knowledge of the plot, even on his own confession, and yet he took no steps to prevent it. No one can suppose that he would have remained quiet under such circumstances, if he abhorred the plot as he professed to do. Garnet himself saw the inconsistency of such a profession, and therefore he pretended that he went to Coughton for the purpose of dissuading Catesby from the attempt on his coming down; and yet Catesby was not to leave London until after the explosion. The use of the words from the hymn has been mentioned, and it was proved that on the *first* of November, when he repeated the verses, he had stirred up his friends to pray for the extirpation of heresy. This was to be done at the beginning of the parliament. Can stronger facts be adduced in proof of his guilt, and that he approved of the project? The prayer he affected to say referred to the state of the

* The following observations from Mr. Hallam are important:—"The Catholic writers maintain that he had no knowledge of the conspiracy, except by having heard it in confession. But this rests altogether on his word; and the prevarication of which he has been proved to be guilty (not to mention the damning circumstance that he was taken at Hendlip in concealment along with the other conspirators), makes it difficult for a candid man to acquit him of a thorough participation of their guilt."—*Const. Hist.* i. 554-5.

Romanists, and was a petition against any fresh laws concerning recusants. It is, however, clear, from his interlocutions with Hall, that this was a mere pretence; and he perceived that it would be so regarded on his trial.

There is another very remarkable circumstance in connexion with Garnet's guilt or innocence in the last examination after his conviction. He was asked "whether he had not conference with Greenwell (Greenway) about some man to be reserved to be protector. He answered that in general he did ask such a question: who answered that that was to be deferred until the blow was passed, and then the protector to be chosen out of the noblemen that should be saved*." Is such an acknowledgment consistent with his repeated declarations that he did what he could to prevent the plot?

On the 3rd of May, 1606, Garnet was taken to the place of execution in St. Paul's Churchyard, a scaffold being erected for the occasion. He was attended by the deans of St. Paul's and Winchester, and by the recorder of London. On being exhorted by the clergymen to prepare for another world, he expressed himself satisfied in that matter. When it was suggested that he should express his views to the people, he alleged the weakness of his voice, and the exhaustion of his bodily strength; but on being desired by the recorder, he addressed the crowd, assuring them that the intention was wicked, and that he entirely abhorred it. The dean of Winchester begged him to act honestly, alleging that he was privy to the whole; on which Garnet declared that he was not aware of the design of blowing up the parliament house. It was said to him in reply, that he had acknowledged that Greenway had told him all; upon which he added that that

* See the Confession in JARDINE, *Criminal Trials*, ii. 333-4; printed from the original in the State Paper Office.

was in confession, and could not be revealed. The dean of Winchester reminded him, that he had almost confessed that the particulars were not communicated in confession, but by way of confession. The various confessions of the prisoner were in the hands of the recorder, who was ready to read them; but Garnet told him that he might spare himself the trouble, as he denied nothing that he had signed.

Having said a few additional words to the people, in reprobation of the plot, he asked the recorder how much time would be permitted for prayer, who informed him that no limit would be set. He then kneeled down at the foot of the ladder, but so distracted was he by surrounding objects, that he occasionally looked round, as if in expectation of a pardon. After some little time, he ascended the ladder, and having removed some of his clothes, he addressed the people, expressing his sorrow for having dissembled in not declaring the truth, until the council had obtained positive proof of his guilt, "but," says he, "I did not think they had such true proofs against me till they showed them to me. As soon as I perceived this, I thought it most becoming to confess, although before it would have been unlawful for me to have accused myself. As to my brother Greenway, I would never have charged him, if I had not believed him to be beyond the sea." While he was using some Latin prayers the ladder was removed, and he was launched into an eternal world*.

Various reports were circulated on the continent respecting Garnet's death. It was said that he evinced much readiness to die: and that the people interposed to prevent the executioner from quartering him while he was alive. This favour was, however, granted by the

* Barlow, 227, 228.

special command of the king. It was stated also that the people nearly destroyed the hangman, whereas no violence was used: and that the crowd maintained a profound silence when the head was held up on the scaffold, whereas that act was attended with loud acclamations. So far were the people from manifesting any sympathy with any of the traitors, that, on the contrary, believing that Spain and the pope had been plotting with the conspirators, they were so excited, that it became necessary for the Spanish ambassador to apply for a guard to protect him from their fury*.

These reports were evidently intended to divert attention from Garnet's crime, and from his ignominious death, and to prepare the way for enrolling his name among the martyrs of the Romish church. To honour his memory it was necessary that some story should be invented, which should give a colour to the proceeding. The miracle of the *straw* was therefore concocted, in order to pave the way into the martyrology. The particulars of this pretended miracle I shall now state.

A young man of the name of Wilkinson, very enthusiastic, pretended that he was seized, the day before, with a strong desire to witness the execution of Garnet, and to preserve some relic of the criminal. He states that he felt convinced that he should witness some direct testimony from God in favour of Garnet's innocence. On the morning of the day of execution, Wilkinson, according to his own account, placed himself near the scaffold. After the quartering, when the head and limbs were placed in a

* "His pious and constant demeanour excited the sympathy of the crowd: their vociferations checked the impatience of the executioner; and the cruel operation of quartering was deferred till he was fully dead."—LINGARD, ix. 68. Dr. Lingard cites no authority, and his assertion respecting the crowd is directly at variance with the fact.

basket, he approached close to the scaffold, standing between it and the cart. Some straw was thrown from the scaffold into the basket, with the head and quarters, and one of the ears of the straw fell into the hand of Wilkinson. He states that he could not tell whether the ear came into his hand from the scaffold or from the basket: he only knew that it came to him before it had touched the ground. The straw was committed to the care of Mrs. N., who covered it with a glass or bottle. Some time after a certain person, viewing the straw, said, "I can see nothing in it but a man's face." They were astonished at this exclamation, and, on carefully examining it, they distinctly discovered a human countenance. Such is the substance of Wilkinson's account, which he related at the Jesuits' College at St. Omer's*.

The straw was inspected by many Romanists: and, among others, by the Spanish ambassador, who pretended to believe in the miracle. At first the parties saw only the outline of a face; but in process of time two faces were discovered, one within the other, surrounded by rays of glory. The one was the head of Garnet, crowned with a martyr's crown: the other that of a cherub on the lower part of the beard. The story was circulated all over the continent, as well as in England: and at last Archbishop Bancroft was commanded to institute an examination, and punish the impostors. In November, 1606, several persons were examined before the archbishop. Wilkinson was on the continent; but Mrs. N. was summoned to appear. She proved to be the wife of a tailor of the name of Griffiths. Griffiths stated that Wilkinson gave the straw to his wife, charging her to preserve it, so that the spots of blood should not be effaced. It was enclosed in a glass bottle the next day.

* Casauboni *Epistolæ*, 420.

Wilkinson remained in the house for some time, and undoubtedly had had it in his possession. Griffiths said that about the 18th of September he happened to be looking carefully at the straw, when he thought he perceived a face, which he pointed out to his wife and to a servant, Thomas Laithwaite, who was present at the time. Griffiths admitted that the face was no more like Garnet than any other man with a long beard, and that it was not surrounded by rays or a light. Laithwaite was next examined, and in several particulars contradicted Griffiths. He stated that he was the first to discover the face: that as he was one day sitting by the fire, he imagined that he saw a man's head upon the straw. On taking it to the light such was the case. He then pointed it out to Wilkinson, to Mrs. Griffiths, and her husband.

At this time the straw was not to be found, so that it could not be submitted to the test of an examination. Robert Barnes, a gentleman from Cambridgeshire, was examined. He had seen the straw, but he saw nothing which any painter could not have produced. The face appeared to this gentleman to have been drawn with a hair, or something very fine*.

It is probable that such a straw actually existed: nay, of this there can be no doubt, from the number of witnesses who were examined; but it is clear that the face was painted by Wilkinson, or by his management†.

* "For a trial, one of the Archbishop of Canterbury's gentlemen (whose profession was not painting), drew one, which Bowen (to whom it had been shown by Anne Vaux) confessed was like that of the straw, but a little better proportioned. As for the thing itself, 'twas only a few lines drawn like a face upon the outward husk of a grain of wheat."—Foulis's *Romish Treasons*, 518.

† It was ironically said at the time, that the man who could enter into a conspiracy against his native country, deserved to be pictured in blood.

The Romanists have always been expert in turning any incident to account; and they acted with their usual craft in this matter. A print of the straw was publicly sold on the Continent. It formed a *frontispiece* to a defence of Garnet, published in 1610, under the assumed name of *Eudæmon Johannes**. The Romanists made the most of the alleged miracle. In a work, published not very long after, entitled *The True Christian Catholic,* it is broadly asserted, that the sight of Garnet's straw caused five hundred persons to embrace the Roman Catholic faith.

From Osborne, a contemporary writer, it would seem that there were more straws than one, on which a face was depicted. One straw only was mentioned by Wilkinson, or by the parties who were examined before the archbishop. Osborne states, that he saw several; from which it would seem, that the trick having succeeded so well, the Romanists pretended that other straws, besides the celebrated one so carefully kept by Wilkinson, were marked in the same manner, as evidences of the innocence of Garnet†. The church of Rome has dealt largely in miracles; she professes to have in her keeping a picture of the Virgin painted by St. Luke: and in the case of Garnet, her members, not being content with one miracle, contrived others; for the multiplication of the *straws* was as great a miracle as the original.

For many years some of the gravest writers of the

* A fac-simile of this representation is given at the commencement of this volume. It was extensively circulated at the time.

† "All the miracle I could observe was the prodigiousness of the attempt, who have had some of those straws in my hands, yet could observe no more than by imposing upon my imagination I found, as may be in all straws else, the resemblance of a beard, and something fancy was at that time apt to cast into the mould of a face, being formerly suborned by the general opinion; yet these no doubt are sold and pass at this day for *reliques,* as I know they did 20 years after, and he for a holy saint."—Osborne's *Works,* 436.

Romish church not only avowed their belief in this miracle, but appealed to it as a proof of Garnet's innocence. This was especially the case with the Jesuits. *Cornelius A. Lapide*, in a comment on the Revelation, alludes to it as an illustration. At one place Garnet's picture was addressed in prayer: "Sancte Henrice, intercede pro nobis." Gordon, a Jesuit, begs him to intercede for the conversion of England. The Jesuit More, who wrote the history of his order, gravely asserts, not satisfied with one straw, that on the lawn at Hindlip, an unknown species of grass sprang up on the spot where the feet of Garnet and Hall last rested before their removal to London. The same writer, and also other papal historians, declare, that the entrails of Hall, which were burnt after his execution according to the sentence, continued burning during sixteen days, although a large quantity of water was used to extinguish the flames*. Another lying tale was, that a spring of oil suddenly burst forth on the spot where Garnet was executed.

That these lies were invented to induce the belief that Garnet was an innocent man, and to prepare the way for his enrolment amongst the martyrs, is evident. The miracle of the straw was intended to afford the pope an excuse for his *beatification*. Garnet was asked, previous to his execution, whether he imagined that the church would declare him a martyr, and whether the church would be acting right in taking such a step. He exclaimed, "*Martyren me, O qualem Martyrem*†." Yet the pope did actually declare him to be a martyr. "This he did," says Fuller, "to qualify the infamy of Garnet's death, and that the perfume of this new title might outscent the stench of his treason‡."

It is scarcely to be credited, that any members of the

* JARDINE, 345. † CASAUBON, 424. ‡ FULLER, b. x.

church of Rome should lend their sanction to such an absurd imposture as that of the straw. Yet the alleged miracle was received almost universally in Roman Catholic countries. A more impudent trick was never imposed upon the public than the publication of the engraving of the straw by Eudæmon Johannes, a Jesuit. I have given a copy of this engraving for the purpose of showing the iniquity of the church of Rome in imposing on the credulity of mankind. The face of Garnet is surrounded by rays of glory, as the head of the Saviour is usually represented. This was intended to lead the public to believe that Garnet was innocent, and a glorious saint. In a circle round the straw is the following inscription, which also marks the views entertained respecting Garnet by the leading Romanists of that day: "*Miraculosa Effigies. R. P. Henrici Garnetti, Soc. Jesu Martyris Angliæ, 3rd Maii*, 1606." The inscription declares that a miracle had been wrought; which was a most evident fabrication; yet none of the Romanists attempted to detect the imposture—on the contrary, they encouraged it by means of various kinds.

A print of the straw was published and circulated in Spain and in the Low Countries. The English Ambassador procured its suppression in the latter, and he applied to the king of Spain to suppress it in the former*. From a letter, addressed by Sir Charles Cornwallis to the Privy Council, dated April 19th, 1607, it appears that, in consequence of his remonstrance, measures were taken by the Spanish court to prevent the public circulation of the prints. "I suppose," says he, "the *strawes* are already become *strawes*, for I hear noe noyse of them†." That the miracle, however, was received not only by foreigners, but by Englishmen on the Continent, is clear, from another letter from Sir Charles Cornwallis to the Earl of Salisbury.

* Winwood, vol. ii. 300. † Ibid. 303.

Speaking of Sir Anthony Shirley, he remarks, "Sir Anthony (as I hear) is a great magnificator of the *strawe miracle**." A ballad on Garnet's death was also published in Spain, to which was appended an engraving of the straw. It came out under the auspices of the Jesuits†.

Various portraits of the criminal were published and circulated by the members of his order. One was circulated in Spain with this inscription: "*Henrico Garnet Ingles, Martoresado en Londres.*" This was complained of by Sir Charles Cornwallis, the English ambassador, who stated that Garnet could not be viewed as a martyr by any persons, except those who considered King James as a tyrant‡.

These facts are conclusive on the question as to the encouragement which the imposture of the *straw* met with from the church of Rome. Though she did not, by any formal document, recognise the pretended miracle, yet Garnet was viewed as a martyr, and thereby the imposition was sanctioned by the church. The various pictures of the straw, too, were circulated by persons in authority, and with the connivance of the pope himself. It is, therefore, evident, that whatever may be the policy of Romanists in the present day, the imposture was sanctioned by the church when the trick was invented. What then should be our views of a church which could give her countenance to such a gross imposition §!

* Winwood, 308. † Ibid. 336. ‡ Ibid. 301.

§ Besides the instances of equivocation mentioned in this chapter, it is pretty certain that the conspirators, as well as the Jesuits, considered it lawful, or, at all events, that they resorted to it to serve their own ends. Thus, Mr. Abington, in his own account of his examination, says, that he was asked by the chief justice whether Tesmond ever advised him to join Sir Everard Digby, Catesby, and Winter, in open rebellion. This, he observes, they could not prove. He was also asked if he knew of Garnet's and Hall's concealment in his house; and he adds, "I, confident that they would not confess anything against me, denied them both."—Jardine, ii. 326.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CONSPIRATORS THOSE OF THE ROMISH CHURCH—ILLUSTRATIONS OF THOSE PRINCIPLES. —THE ENGLISH EXILES PROTECTED BY THE POPE.—SIR EVERARD DIGBY.—THE CHURCH OF ROME IMPLICATED.

A BRIEF account of those principles on which the conspirators acted, and which were regarded by them as those of their church, will not be unacceptable to the reader. It is true that many Roman Catholics deprecated the plot, and the course taken by the conspirators; but still it is by no means easy to clear the church of Rome of the guilt of the transaction, since she then entertained principles, which appeared to justify the attempt of the parties who were implicated in the treason. That the Jesuits were the life of the conspiracy has already been shown in the narrative. They animated the conspirators when they were dispirited, —warranted the proposed action when they were in doubt, —and absolved them from its guilt after the discovery. Nay, they pronounced the deed to be meritorious. They swore them to secrecy, and bound them together to the performance of the treason by means of the sacrament. The great wheels, therefore, by which the whole was set in motion, were the Jesuits; but the arch-traitor was the pope himself, who had sent his bulls into England, to endeavour to prevent the accession of King James; for it has been shown that the treason originated in those bulls.

It is an acknowledged principle of the church of Rome, that the decisions of general councils are binding on all. There are disputes amongst her divines respecting some of the councils, whether they were general, or not; but con-

cerning the decisions of those conncils which have never been disputed, there is no question with Romanists. Now some of the undisputed councils enforce doctrines at variance with Scripture, and destructive, not merely of the welfare, but of the very existence, of Protestant states and Protestant sovereigns, provided the papal see is sufficiently powerful to carry out its principles into action. No king was completely master in his own dominions, when the papacy was at its height.

The Third Council of Lateran was convened by Pope Alexander III., A.D. 1179. Its efforts were directed especially against the Albigenses and Waldenses, who were guilty of no crime, except the unpardonable one of opposing the errors of the church of Rome. Twenty-seven canons were framed by this council; all of them on matters of trivial importance with the exception of the last, which is directed against the poor exiles who were bold enough to prefer their own salvation to a blind submission to the church. The *Twenty-seventh* canon imposes a curse on all those who maintained or favoured the Waldensian opinions. In the event of dying in their alleged errors, they were not even to receive Christian burial*.

The fourth council of Lateran was held A.D. 1215. One of its canons, the *Third*, is even more horrible than the preceding. All heretics are excommunicated, and delivered over to the secular arm for punishment; while temporal princes are enjoined to extirpate heresy by all means

* "Although ecclesiastical discipline, being content with the judgment of the priests, does not take sanguinary revenge, yet it is assisted by the decrees of Catholic princes, that men may often seek a saving remedy, through fear of corporal punishment. On this account we decree to subject them (the heretics) and their defenders to anathema: and, under pain of anathema, we forbid that any receive them into his house, or have any dealings with them. Nor let them receive burial among Christians."—See *Labb. et Coss.*, Tom. x. 1518-9.

in their power*. This exterminating canon is still unrepealed, and may be acted on whenever the church of Rome may have the power to enforce it. It has been attempted in modern times to deny the genuineness of the *Third Canon;* but the attempt was unsuccessful. It has also been pronounced *obsolete.* It is undoubtedly inoperative, simply because the church cannot carry it into execution; but it is still the law of the Roman church.

The council of Constance, A.D. 1415, decided that faith was not to be kept with heretics to the prejudice of the church; and, therefore, John Huss was committed to the flames, in violation of the solemn promise of the emperor.

By these councils all heretics are devoted to destruction. They proclaim principles exactly similar to those on which the conspirators acted;—in other words, the conspirators acted on the principles promulgated by these councils, as those of the church of Rome. On these principles did the Jesuits justify the treason, and declare the traitors innocent.

Attempts are made in modern times to prove that the canons alluded to are not binding on the church; but the hand of Providence has made the church of Rome set her seal to her own condemnation in this matter; for by the decrees of the council of Trent and the creed of Pope

* "We excommunicate and condemn every heresy, which exalteth itself against this holy and Catholic Faith. Let such persons, when condemned, be left to the secular powers, to be punished in a fitting manner. And let the secular powers be admonished, and, if need be, compelled, that they should set forth an oath, that to the utmost of their power, they will strive to exterminate all heretics who shall be denounced by the church. But if any temporal lord shall neglect to cleanse his country of this heretical filth, let him be bound by the chain of excommunication. If he shall scorn to make satisfaction, let it be signified to the supreme pontiff, that he may declare his vassals to be absolved from their fidelity."—*Labb et Coss.* Tom. xi. 147-9. This canon was also received into the *Canon Law,* by Gregory IX. It was carried into effect against the Albigenses.

Pius IV., every papist is pledged to receive the decisions of all general councils*. The only question, therefore, to be decided is this, namely, whether these councils are regarded as *general* by the church of Rome. Respecting the *third* and *fourth* Lateran councils, there never was any doubt. It is very remarkable, nay, providential, that the fourth Lateran council is especially alluded to by the council of Trent. One of the decisions of this very council is specified and renewed by the Trent decrees. The church of Rome has declared, therefore, by her last council,—a council, too, by which all her doctrines were unalterably fixed,—that the Lateran council is to be received by all her members; and, as if to obviate all cavil on the subject, and also to prevent any Romanist from saying that this council was not a general one, and consequently not binding on the church, the council of Trent has expressly designated it a general council. And still further, the council of Trent has particularly specified one of the Lateran decrees, by quoting the first two words: "All other decrees made by Julius the Third, as also the constitution of Pope Innocent the Third, in a general council, which commences *Qualiter et Quando*, which this holy synod renews, shall be observed by all†."

* "The holy synod decrees and commands, that the holy canons, and all general councils, and also all constitutions of the Apostolic See, which have been made in favour of ecclesiactical persons and of ecclesiastical liberty, and against the infringers of it, (all of which it revives by this present decree,) be exactly observed by all, as they ought to be."—*Conc. Trent.*, Sess. xxv., *De Ref.*, Can. 20. It is observable too, that emperors and kings are commanded to observe these canons. This is surely a revival of the Lateran canon. The creed also is most explicit on this subject: "I do undoubtedly receive and profess all other things which have been delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons, and œcumenical councils, and especially by the holy synod of Trent; and all other things contrary thereto, and all heresies condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church, I do likewise condemn, reject, and anathematize."

† *Council of Trent*, Sess. xxiv., cap. 5. It is therefore vain for

Two things are here to be noted. First, the council held under Innocent III. is expressly termed a general council: and this council was the *Fourth Lateran*. Secondly, a particular canon of the council is specified and renewed, so that no doubt can possibly exist as to the particular council to which the reference is made. The charge, therefore, of holding persecuting and exterminating doctrines is fastened upon the church of Rome, by these decrees of the council of Trent.

The reader will also perceive that the council of Trent revives and confirms all the constitutions of the apostolic see; that is, all the determinations of the canon law. It would be easy to justify persecution and death from innumerable portions of the canon law. And how can any Romanist allege that the canon law is not binding, when it is expressly confirmed by the council of Trent? It includes all the bulls and decrees of the popes. None of the persecuting decrees have been repealed; and until the church of Rome renounces them by a solemn and public act, she will be obnoxious to the charge of maintaining the duty of persecuting heretics. None of the laws respecting heresy have ever been relaxed; no sovereign was ever censured for punishing heretics; no council has ever relieved the papal sovereigns from the execution of the laws to which I have alluded; nor was any one ever condemned by the head of the church for putting Protestants to death. Until, therefore, Rome repeals her exterminating decrees, she must submit to the heavy charge of maintaining the right to persecute men for their religious belief.

any papist to pretend, in the face of such authority, that there is a doubt whether the Lateran was a general council. In all the editions of the councils it is so designated; it is found in the list of councils appended to the editions of the canon law; and in the canon law itself it is thus reckoned. It is recognised by the council of Constance; and last, though not least, by the council of Trent itself.

It is well known that the BULL IN CŒNA DOMINI is read in the hearing of the pope every Maunday Thursday. By that bull all Protestants are excommunicated and anathematized; and will any one say that the church of Rome would not execute the sentence of excommunication if she possessed the power? To assert the contrary assuredly argues either great obstinacy or egregious folly.

To the bull *In Cœna Domini* may be added the oath to the pope taken by every bishop on his elevation to the episcopal dignity, by which he engages to *persecute and attack heretics.*

That those whom the church of Rome has denominated heretics, have been put to death whenever she has been sufficiently powerful to enforce her own decrees, is a point which cannot be denied. But to the sin of cruelty, in burning men for their opinions, the church of Rome has added the crime of deep dissimulation and hypocrisy, in the very act of consigning the sufferers to the flames. Before the alleged heretics were punished, they were delivered over to the secular powers, by whom the penalties were to be inflicted; so that the civil magistrate became the executioner of the sentence. To such an extent was this hypocrisy carried by the church, that the bishop who delivered up an alleged heretic to death, was commanded by the *Pontifical*, by which all such things are regulated, to intercede for the sufferer. The instructions in the *Pontifical* are of such a character that the church of Rome cannot clear herself of the double charge of cruelty and hypocrisy. "Domine Judex, rogamus vos, cum omni affectu, quo possumus, ut amore Dei, pietatis et misericordiæ intuitu, et nostrorum interventu precaminum, miserimo huic nullam mortis vel mutilationis periculam inferatis." Hypocrisy more awful could not be prac-

tised. The secular magistrate was merely the servant of the church, and could not refuse to carry out the sentence.

Such are the principles of the Romish church as embodied in her councils and her canon law. If they are true, then the gunpowder conspirators were justified in their proceedings: nay, they were acting a meritorious part in the prosecution of that design.

Nor have the doctors and eminent supporters of that church hesitated to avow the same principles in days that are past, though in modern times, it has been attempted to deny them, or explain them away. How modern Romanists can consistently deny that such doctrines are enjoined by their church, appears to me inexplicable, except on the jesuitical principle of equivocation, which will enable them to pursue any course calculated to advance the interests of the apostolic see; and though Romanists generally repudiate such doctrines, yet it is asserted in the theology of Dens, and taught at Maynooth, and doubtless in other similar institutions, that heretics are the subjects of the church of Rome, and that they are to be capitally punished*. A host of writers might be alleged, who assert that it is lawful to punish heretics with death.

The objection is not unfrequently alleged by Romanists, when pressed in an argument by the authority of names in high repute in their church, that "the church is not bound by the views of particular individuals." The views of these individuals, however, are those of the church. But further, why are not these views censured if the church does not maintain them? The church of Rome has published an *Index Expurgatorius et Prohibitorum*, in which not only Protestant works are included, but many

* Dens, ii. 288. Reiffenstuel quotes the third canon of the fourth Lateran no less than eighteen times in one chapter, and he declares that impenitent heretics are to be put to death.

passages in the works of well known Romanists are marked for erasure as containing sentiments akin to those of the Protestant churches. As, therefore, the church of Rome has not hesitated to expunge passages from the writings of her own members, when she has deemed them at variance with her principles, why, if she views those portions of the works to which I allude, and which enforce the persecution of heretics even to death, to be erroneous, does she not adopt the same process respecting them? As she has not so, the undoubted inference is, that these writings are not disapproved of by the church.

Nearly allied to the punishment of heresy is the question of the pope's deposing power. It is asserted in the canons already quoted, and which cannot be disputed; and it is also asserted by numerous writers, whose works have never been censured in an *Index*. Bellarmine says, "It is agreed upon amongst all, that the pope may lawfully depose heretical princes and free their subjects from yielding obedience to them." Can it be denied, therefore, that such was the doctrine of the church of Rome in the time of Bellarmine? And if such was the doctrine of that church then, it must be the doctrine of the same church now, since none of her articles of faith have been changed, none of her doctrines have been repudiated. It is true that the doctrine is not insisted on by modern Romanists; but what security have we that the claim would not be revived if the church of Rome should ever possess sufficient power to enforce it? We must therefore insist on charging these and similar doctrines on the church of Rome, until she renounces them by a solemn and public decision. "Indeed," says Tillotson, "this doctrine hath not been at all times alike frankly and openly avowed; but it is undoubtedly theirs, and hath frequently been put in execution, though they have not thought it so convenient at all times

to make profession of it. It is a certain kind of engine, which is to be screwed up or let down as occasion serves: and is commonly kept like Goliah's sword in the sanctuary behind the ephod, but yet so that the high-priest can lend it out upon an extraordinary occasion. And for practices consonant to these doctrines, I shall go no further than the horrid and bloody design of this day."

It is singular that there is no express mention of the deposing power in the decrees of the council of Trent. The pope and the fathers perceived that times were already altered, that sovereigns were not likely to submit tamely to such an assumption of authority, and that their proceedings must be managed with more craft than formerly. Still the deposing power was established by implication, in the ratification of the decrees of the Lateran council: and we know that it was exercised at a subsequent period against Queen Elizabeth. Parsons declared, that it was the doctrine of all learned men, and agreeable to the apostolic injunctions. It was not always a speculative doctrine. History shows that many wars have been waged through this very principle. In some cases the papal decree has been carried into effect, and in others it has led to war and bloodshed, some states having always been ready to attempt to carry out the sentence.

The following list will show how frequently the Roman pontiffs in the days of their glory, claimed the power of deposing sovereigns.

A.D.

1075. Gregory VII. deposed Henry IV. the emperor.

1088. Urban II. deposed Philip, king of France.

1154. Adrian IV. deposed *William*, king of Sicily.

1198. Innocent III. deposed the Emperor Philip, and King John of England.

1227. Gregory IX. deposed the Emperor Frederic II.
1242. Innocent IV. deposed the emperor.
1261. Urban IV. deposed Manphred, king of Sicily.
1277. Nicholas III. deposed Charles, king of Sicily.
1281. Martin IV. deposed Peter of Arragon.
1284. Boniface VIII. deprived Philip the Fair*.
1305. Clement V. deposed the Emperor Henry V.
1316. John XXII. deprived the Emperor Lodovic.
1409. Alexander V. deposed the king of Naples.
1538. Paul III. deprived Henry VIII. of England.
1570. Pius V. deprived Queen Elizabeth, as did also some of his successors. This is a sample of papal attempts against kings; and it proves that the popes have always lost sight of St. Peter's character, though pretending to act as his successors. Our own sovereigns have often felt the weight of the papal power. King Edgar was enjoined by Dunstan, the abbot of Glastonbury, not to wear his crown for seven years, to which he was compelled to submit. Henry II. was forced to walk barefooted three miles to visit Becket's shrine, and there to receive fourscore lashes from the monks on his bare back. King John was compelled to resign his crown to the pope's legate, and take it back on condition of paying a yearly sum of a thousand marks to the pope.

The pages of history are pregnant with proofs that the practices of the church have exactly corresponded with the principles asserted in the decrees of councils, in the canon law, and in the works of their eminent writers. Queen Elizabeth escaped; but several continental sovereigns fell a sacrifice to the fury of the church of Rome. Henry III.

* This pope in his bull says, "*We declare and pronounce it as necessary to salvation, that all mankind be subject to the Roman pontiff.*" This bull is a part of the *canon law*.

of France was murdered in 1589, by a Dominican friar, who was encouraged to the commission of the act by the prior of his convent. Henry was a member of the church of Rome; but he was not zealous in executing the laws against heretics. On account, therefore, of his supposed want of zeal, he was devoted to destruction. The deed was lauded in sermons and in books; while the murderer, who was destroyed on the spot, was deemed a martyr in the cause of the church. At Rome, the fact was applauded by the pope in a set speech to the cardinals. The act was contrasted by his holiness, with those of Eleazar and Judith, and the palm was given to the friar. Nay, it was compared in greatness to the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. The following is an extract from this most blasphemous speech:—

"Considering seriously with myself, and applying myself to these things which are now come to pass, I may use the words of the prophet Habakkuk: 'Behold, ye among the heathen, and regard, and wonder marvellously; for I will work a work in your days, which ye will not believe, though it be told you;' i. 5. The French king is slain by the hands of a friar. For unto this it may be compared, though the prophet spake of our Lord's incarnation. This is a memorable and almost incredible thing, not accomplished without the particular providence of God. A friar has killed a king. That the king is dead, is credible; but that he is killed in such a manner is hardly credible: even as we assert that Christ is born of a woman; but if we add of a virgin; then, according to human reason, we cannot assent to it. This great work is to be ascribed to a particular providence."

In this strain did the head of the Roman church laud the murder of Henry III. of France. The deed was reckoned by his holiness as glorious a work as the incar-

nation of the Saviour, and his resurrection from the dead. Surely, the principles and practices of the church were in exact correspondence at that time. The principles have never been relinquished; but circumstances control the actions of the church, so that she cannot kill and slay with impunity.

Henry IV. of France also fell a sacrifice to the same principles. He had been an advocate of Protestaut doctrines; but from motives of human policy he united himself with the church of Rome. Still, as he did not persecute his Protestant subjects, the sincerity of his conversion was called in question by the church. In less than one month after his public profession of the papal faith, an attempt was made on his life by an assassin, who had been encouraged by the reasonings of certain friars and jesuits. After several escapes, he was stabbed in the street by a man who had formerly been a monk. His death was not celebrated publicly by the pope, as was that of Henry III., but the jesuits and the friars justified the act, and proved that, on the principles of the church, it was lawful to put him to death, though a Romanist, since he was not zealous against heresy, and in the cause of the papal see. King Henry had also communicated secret information to Cecil, prior to the discovery of the Gunpowder Treason, respecting the machinations of the jesuits and seminary priests. The very fact that the French monarch should convey intelligence to King James, was a deadly crime in the eyes of the jesuits. It was supposed at the time, and nothing has since transpired to lead to a different conclusion, that the part he acted, in communicating information to the English court, hastened his tragical end. The memory of the assassin was in consequence held in great veneration at Rome, for a considerable period after the event. The assassins of both these monarchs arknowledged

that they were prompted to commit the murders, by the instigation of two jesuits, and the reading of the works of a third.

The massacre of St. Bartholomew is too well known to need the recital of its horrid particulars. I allude to it merely to show how the principles and practices of the church of Rome correspond, whenever she has the power to act. The crime was consecrated by the pope, who went in grand procession to church, to return thanks to God for so great a blessing as the destruction of the heretics.

It appears that the tidings of the massacre reached Rome on the 6th of September, 1572. The consistory of cardinals was immediately assembled, when the letter from the papal legate, containing the particulars of the massacre, was read. It was immediately determined to repair to the church of St. Mark, where their solemn thanks were offered up to God for this great blessing. Two days after, the pope and cardinals went in procession to the church of Minerva, when high mass was celebrated. The pope also granted a jubilee to all Christendom, and one reason assigned was, *that they should thank God for the slaughter of the enemies of the church, lately executed in France.* Two days later, the cardinal of Lorraine headed another great procession of cardinals, clergy, and ambassadors, to the chapel of St. Lewis, where he himself celebrated mass. In the name of the king of France, the cardinal thanked the pope and the cardinals, for the aid they had afforded his majesty by their counsels and prayers, of which he had experienced the happy effects. On his own part, and on the part of the church, the pope sent a legate to thank the king for his zeal in the extirpation of the heretics, and to beseech him to persevere in the great and holy work. The legate, in passing through France, gave a plenary absolution to all who had been actors in the massacre.

On the evening of the day on which the news arrived at Rome, the guns were fired from the castle of St. Angelo; and the same rejoicings were practised as were common on receiving the intelligence of an important victory. The pope looked upon the massacre, as one of the greatest felicities which could have happened at the beginning of his papacy.

In addition to these public rejoicings on the part of the pope and his cardinals at Rome, other means were adopted to indicate the sense of the church on the massacre. Medals were struck to commemorate the event. On the one side was a representation of the slaughter, an angel cutting down the heretics, and on the other, the head of the pope, Gregory XIII. On these medals, was this inscription, "*Ugonottorum Strages*, 1572." The slaughter was also deemed worthy of being commemorated on tapestry, which was placed in the pope's chapel. In the paintings which were executed, the slaughter of the Huguenots was depicted, "*Colignii et Sociorum cædes;*" and in another part, "*Rex Colignii cædam probat.*"

Let it be remembered that the principles of the church of Rome are unchanged, and, as the Romanists themselves aver, unchangeable. The circumstances of Europe are widely different from what they were in the sixteenth century; and Romanists themselves are under the restraint of wholesome laws and public opinion; but were the popes of modern days to be supported by sovereigns like Charles IX. of France, or were they possessed of the same power as was once enjoyed by their predecessors, is it reasonable to suppose, that the principles which are still retained, would not be carried out into practice; or that the same scenes, which then disgraced the civilized world, would not again be enacted in every country in which the jesuits and other active emissaries of the papacy could obtain a footing?

Is it not clear from the preceding facts, that the murderers of Henry III. and IV. and the actors in the massacre of St. Bartholomew considered that they were acting a meritorious part? They were taught that the pope could depose kings and grant their kingdoms to others; and they knew that the pope had often exercised that power. The Gunpowder conspirators were men of the same class and influenced by the same views. Knowing that all heretics were annually excommunicated, they believed that they were authorized to carry the sentence into effect; and having been taught that heretical princes might lawfully be deposed, they considered themselves at liberty to attempt their destruction. The assassins of the French monarchs, and the Gunpowder traitors, being encouraged by the authority of the church, as explained by their spiritual directors, entered upon their deeds of darkness, with an assurance, that they were merely fulfilling the wishes of their ghostly fathers.

The pope endeavoured to clear himself from the guilt of being privy to the Gunpowder Treason; yet some of those who were implicated in the plot were protected by the pontiff. Had his holiness been sincere in his professions to King James, he would have delivered up those jesuits who were connected with the treason. The surrender of the conspirators would have been the strongest proof of his sincerity. But not only did he not give them up to the sovereign whose life they had sought: he did not even call them to account for the part which they had taken in the conspiracy.

Not only were the conspirators protected by the pope and the king of Spain; but they were so favoured, that it cannot with any justice be pretended, that the treason was held in abhorrence, either by the pontiff or the Spanish monarch. A few facts will set this matter in so

clear a light, that no one can reasonably doubt what were the views of these sovereigns. Owen and Baldwin were in Flanders at the period of the discovery of the treason. The English ambassador at Brussels demanded, in his majesty's name, that they should be surrendered into his hands. It was answered that they could do nothing with Baldwin, because he was a member of a religious order, but that he must be referred to his superiors for censure: and that they must await the arrival of instructions from Spain, before they could take any steps with respect to Owen. This demand is mentioned in a letter dated the 27th of December, 1605*. The ambassador in the Low Countries, Sir Thomas Edmonds, wrote to Sir Charles Cornwallis, the ambassador at the court of Spain, on the subject, begging him to interpose. The matter was submitted to the Spanish council: and instead of pursuing an open and honest course, they referred it to the pope's nuncio, who used his utmost exertions to induce the king of Spain to refuse to comply with the demands of King James†. At last the ambassador obtained an answer to this effect, that Baldwin, being a jesuit, was out of their power, and that Owen had been naturalized in Spain‡. The Spanish minister confessed to Sir Charles Cornwallis, that the pope's nuncio had interfered in favour of the two conspirators§.

It appears that Owen was committed to prison at Brussels on the application of the English ambassador. The imprisonment was evidently intended as a blind: for there could have been no intention of yielding up either Owen or Baldwin||. This is further evident from the liberation of Owen from prison, which was granted on the refusal of the English government to send the documents

* Winwood, ii. 183. † Ibid. 186. ‡ Ibid. 187.
§ Ibid. 188. || Ibid. 190.

used at the trial of the Gunpowder traitors to Brussels*. Some time after his liberation, Owen went into Spain†. From these facts it is clear that the pope's influence was used to prevent the surrender of the individuals who, though they had resided on the Continent, were privy to the treason. Gerard and Greenway, of whose guilt there could be no doubt, and who quitted England after the 5th of November, were also encouraged and protected at Rome.

I would not charge the guilt of that conspiracy on the members of the church of Rome indiscriminately, for there were many who were horror-struck at the deed, and there always have been many who did not receive all the principles maintained by the church; but I contend that the head of the church, the pope of that day, approved of the act, or he would never have adopted the course which he then pursued; and in his guilt all the leading members of the conclave were also implicated. We can only judge of men by their actions; which, if they mean anything, certainly involve the church of Rome of that period in the guilt of the treason. Garnet was regarded as a martyr, not as a traitor; and the absurd miracle of the *Straw* was sanctioned at Rome. These facts certainly involve the then church of Rome in the treason; and as her principles are unchanged, there would be no security against the same practices, were circumstances to favour her ascendency‡.

It is also worthy of remark, that the jesuits who were privy to the design, never expressed the least remorse for

* Winwood, ii. 233. † Ibid. 258.

‡ Hallam remarks, "There seems, indeed, some ground for suspicion, that the Nuncio at Brussels was privy to the conspiracy; though this ought not to be asserted as an historical fact."—*Const. Hist.*, i. 554.

the part they had taken; on the contrary, they never failed to speak of the treason as a glorious and meritorious deed. Grant, as has been noticed already, gloried in the deed, even just before his death; and considered it as so meritorious, that all his other sins would be forgiven on account of the part he had taken in the treason*.

Who can deny, after these facts, that the church of Rome was deeply involved in the gunpowder treason? Or who can exculpate her, even at present, from the charge of maintaining principles subversive of Christian liberty and Protestant governments? When one of the conspirators, who was received by the governor of Calais, was condoled with, on being banished his country, he replied, "It is the least part of our grief that we are banished our native country; this doth truly and heartily grieve us, that we could not bring so generous and wholesome a design to perfection."

Sir Everard Digby was a mild and amiable man, and, with the exception of his participation in the plot, no stain rests upon his character; yet he seems to have considered that, by engaging in this treason, he was really doing God service. His letters, written during his imprisonment, and published by Bishop Barlow in 1679, illustrate the influence of the principles of the church of Rome on the mind of an otherwise excellent individual. They were written with the juice of a lemon or an orange: written, too, when he had time to reflect in his solitary cell, yet it is evident that he thought he was advancing the cause of true religion in the part which he took; and, further, that he was never convinced that the deed was sinful, so completely had the jesuitical principles of the prime actors in the conspiracy warped his judgment and influenced his views. The papers were discovered in the house of Charles Corn-

* Casaubon, 406.

wallis, Esq., who was the executor of Sir Kenelm Digby, the son and heir of Sir Everard.

The letters were by some secret means conveyed to his lady, and were preserved in the family as sacred relics. "Sir Everard Digby," says Archbishop Tillotson in his sermon on the fifth of November, "whose very original papers and letters are now in my hands, after he was in prison, and knew he must suffer, calls it the best cause, and was extremely troubled to hear it censured by Catholics and priests, contrary to his expectations, for a great sin." The letters were also once in the possession of Bishop Burnet, as he himself informs us. From him we learn how they were discovered. "The family being ruined upon the death of Sir Kenelm's son, when the executors were looking out for writings to make out the titles of the estates they were to sell, they were directed by an old servant to a cupboard that was very artificially hid, in which some papers lay that she had observed *Sir Kenelm* was oft reading. They, looking into it, found a velvet bag, within which there were two other silk bags, (so carefully were those relics kept,) and there was within these a collection of all the letters that *Sir Everard* writ during his imprisonment."

A few extracts will show what his sentiments were concerning the plot.

"Now, for my intention let me tell you, that if I had thought there had been the least sin in the plot, I would not have been of it for all the world; and no other cause drew me to hazard my fortune and life, but zeal to God's religion. For my keeping it secret, it was caused by certain belief, that those which were best able to judge of the lawfulness of it, had been acquainted with it, and given way unto it."

"Now, let me tell you, what a grief it hath been to

me, to hear that so much condemned, which I did believe would have been otherwise thought on by Catholics."

"Oh! how full of joy should I die, if I could do any thing for the cause which I love more than my life."

He was questioned respecting the sacrament; his answer shows the influence of the principles which he had imbibed:—

"Yesterday I was before Mr. Attorney, and my Lord Chief Justice, who asked me if I had taken the sacrament to keep secret the plot, as others did. I said that I had not, because I would avoid the question of at whose hands it were."

Respecting the pope's concurrence he has the following passage:—

"Before that I knew anything of the plot, I did ask Mr. Farmer, what the meaning of the pope's brief was: he told me that they were not (meaning priests) to undertake or procure stirs; but yet they would not hinder any, neither was it the pope's mind they should, that should be undertaken for Catholic good. I did never utter thus much, nor would not but to you; and this answer, with Mr. Catesby's proceedings with him and me, gave me absolute belief that the matter in general was approved, though every particular was not known."

Then alluding to the presence of some Romanist peers at the opening of parliament, he adds:—

"I do not think there would have been three worth saving that should have been lost."

In another letter he observes:—

"I could give unanswerable reasons, both for the good that this would have done for the Catholic cause, and my being from home, but I think it now needless, and for some respects unfit."

The last letter is a long one, and is addressed to his

sons; he strongly urges them to continue in the faith of the church of Rome, but he does not express any sorrow for his crime; nor does he caution them against being engaged in similar conspiracies. It is, therefore, clear, that he viewed the deed as laudable and meritorious, even at the close of his career.

It appears certain that many of the Romanists, both at home and abroad, were aware that some extensive conspiracy was on foot. A particular prayer was used, it is said, by numbers in England, for the success of the conspiracy; it was couched in the following terms: "Prosper, Lord, their pains, that labour in thy cause day and night; let heresy vanish like smoke; let the memory of it perish with a crack, like the ruin and fall of a broken house." It would appear that this prayer was framed by one who was privy to the conspiracy; nor can it be doubted that it was intended to convey some intimation of the nature of the treason*. I am aware, that no Romanist would in the present day justify the deed; but the preceding facts prove, that the act was applauded and justified at the time by the whole church almost, and for a considerable period afterwards. To justify the treason now, would be to expose the parties who did so, to the execration of an indignant public. The principles of Rome, however, are exactly what they were when the bulls of the pope were sent to Garnet, and when the gunpowder treason was planned. Tillotson forcibly observes, "I would not be understood to charge every particular person, who is, or hath been in the Roman communion, with the guilt of those or the like practices; but I must charge their doctrines and principles with them. I must charge the heads

* "Father Parsons, rector of the English College there, ordered the students to pray *for the intention of their Father Rector.*"—Foulis, 509.

of their church, and the prevalent teaching and governing part of it, who are usually the contrivers and abettors, the executioners and applauders of these cursed designs*."

It was decided by Pope Urban II. that it was neither treason nor murder to kill those who were excommunicated by the church. So that any treason or murder could be justified on such principles. Nor has any change been effected in the principles of the church of Rome. "Popery," says Burnet, "cannot change its nature, and *cruelty and breach of faith to heretics*, are as necessary parts of that religion, as *transubstantiation* and *the pope's supremacy*†." Andrew Marvel wittily remarks of the pope's claim, "He has, indeed, of late, been somewhat more retentive than formerly as to his faculty of disposing of kingdoms, the thing not having succeeded well with him in some instances, but he lays the same claim still, continues the same inclinations, and though velvet-headed hath the more itch to be pushing. And, however, in order to any occasion he keeps himself in breath, always by cursing one prince or other upon every Maundy Thursday‡."

* Tillotson's *Works*, 12mo., vol. i. 349.

† Burnet's *Eighteen Papers*, 84.

‡ *The Growth of Popery*, 9.—In addition to the evidence already adduced respecting Garnet's guilt, I subjoin the following extract: "Nos autem certò scimus, et sine ulla hesitatione affirmare audemus, P. Garnettum sceleris illius non tantum fuisse conscium; verum etiam approbatorem, et genere quodam auctorem."—Casaubon, 408. Stillingfleet asks, "What mark of dishonour was there set on any one of the conspirators? Two of the *Jesuits*, upon their arrival at *Rome*, met with such hard usage, that one was made the pope's *pœnitentiary*, the other a *confessor* in St. Peter's at Rome."—Stillingfleet's *Sermon*, Nov. 5, 1673, p. 49.

CHAPTER IX.

ROMAN CATHOLIC PEERS—MORDAUNT.—SERVICE FOR THE FIFTH OF NOVEMBER—ALTERATIONS IN THE SERVICE TO SUIT THE LANDING OF KING WILLIAM.—CONCLUSION.

It was natural, after the discovery of such a treason, that some of the Roman Catholics should be suspected of being acquainted with the intentions of the conspirators. Accordingly, several peers, amongst whom were the Earl of Northumberland and Lord Mordaunt, were committed to prison, and, after some time, subjected to heavy fines. The former nobleman was related to Percy: the latter was on terms of intimacy with Keys. They were not implicated in the plot, but it was not unreasonable that the government should have suspected them. Keys had resided with Lord Mordaunt on some occasions. There is an account of this nobleman in a work printed in 1685*, from which a few extracts may be given. "Henry Lord Mordaunt, the only son of his father, after whose decease he inherited his honors and his lands, was of a family wherein it was hard to extinguish their inclination to the old religion." After mentioning his hospitality and his affection to the crown, the writer proceeds, "But there happening a conjuncture which rendered those of his profession under much suspicion and jealousy, from the proceedings of that conspiracy, called the Gunpowder Treason, which, if it had succeeded, would have been of so cruel a consequence.

* "Succinct Genealogies of the noble and ancient houses of Alno or De Alneto, Broc of Shephale, Latimer of Dunlish, Drayton of Drayton, Morduit of Werminster, Greene of Drayton, Vere of Addington, Fitz-Lewis of Westhorneden, Howard of Effingham, and Mordaunt of Turvey. By Robert Halsted. London, 1685."

This worthy lord was involved in the unhappy troubles it produced to most of his persuasion, for upon surmise of his holding correspondence with the trayters, the innocent lord was seized in his house and committed prisoner to the Tower, for which there could never be produced other grounds than his professed religion, his being absent from that Parliament (which was upon leave), and some neighbourly correspondencies he had held with Sir Everard Digby, and certain others of the conspirators, which were but slender means for so large suffering*." The writer adds, that his long imprisonment was the means of shortening his days. Still we cannot feel surprised at the jealousies and suspicions of the government towards men, who were on terms of intimacy with the conspirators.

Mr. Charles Butler states, that Gerard, the Jesuit, was never brought to trial, and then he adds, "a strong argument in favour of his innocence†." This is not very candid in Mr. Butler, for Gerard escaped to the continent very soon after the proclamation against the Jesuits, so that it was not possible to bring him to trial. Had he been taken, he would have been tried with Garnet. No argument, therefore, in favour of his innocence can be built on the fact that he was not brought to trial. Mr. Butler's language would lead to the belief that he remained in this country, and that the Government permitted him to continue unmolested.

It was appointed by Act of Parliament, that the Fifth of November should be annually observed in commemoration of our national deliverance. A particular service,

* The work from which these extracts are taken, though bearing the name of Halsted, was compiled by Henry, earl of Peterborough, and his chaplain, Mr. Ram, rector of Turvey. The work appears to have been privately printed, and it is said that twenty-four copies only were struck off. The above extracts were taken from a copy in the University Library, at Cambridge.

† BUTLER'S *Memoirs*, i. 260.

therefore, was prepared for the occasion, and published in 1606*. It was set forth by the authority of the crown. The original service was used from that time until the year 1662, when it underwent several alterations, with the exception of the period of the Commonwealth, when forms of prayer were altogether discarded.

It appears, however, from Fuller, that, in his time, not only was the service laid aside, but that the observance of the day was very much neglected. "If this plot," says he, "had taken effect, the papists would have celebrated this day with all solemnity; and it would have taken the upper hand of all other festivals. The more, therefore, the shame and pity, that amongst Protestants the keeping of this day (not yet full fifty years old) begins already to wax weak and decay; so that the red letters, wherever it is written, seem to grow dimmer and paler in our English calendar. God forbid that our thankfulness for this great deliverance, formerly so solemnly observed, should hereafter be like the *squibs* which the apprentices in London make on this day; and which give a great flash and crack at first, but soon go out in a stink†."

This was written, or, at all events, the work was published, during the Commonwealth; and it would seem that

* The title of the original form is, "Prayers and Thanksgivings to be used by all the King's Majestie's loving Subjects, for the happy deliverance of his Majesty, the Queen, Prince, and States of Parliament, from the most traiterous and bloody intended massacre by Gunpowder, the 5th of November, 1605. London, 1606."

† Fuller, book x. 38. From several of the incidental notices in the works of writers of the times of James I. and Charles I., we learn that the observance of the day was gradually neglected. In a curious work of the date of 1618, there is a notice to the effect that the people were cold in praising God for their deliverance.—See Garey's *Amphitheatrum Scelerum*. 4to. 1618. In the reigns of Charles II. and James II., when the dread of popery was general, the people universally observed the Fifth of November as a day of thanksgiving to God.

the various religious parties of the period, though hostile to popery, did not pay much attention to the observance of the day, probably because it had been set apart as a holy day by the church of England. The fact that the day was observed by the Anglican church, was quite sufficient to induce the presbyterians and sectaries to disregard it. On no other ground can this neglect of which Fuller speaks be accounted for; since the religious parties of that period were all animated with feelings of the bitterest hostility towards the church of Rome.

It seems that the Tuesday in every week, the day on which the fifth of November fell that year, was for some time observed as a day of thanksgiving. We are told that the circumstances "made so strong an impression of religious gratitude on the mind of Prince Henry, that, in memory of his deliverance, and in imitation of his royal father's example, he would never after suffer himself to be prevented by any business from being present at the sermon appointed to be preached every Tuesday, the day of the week on which the plot was intended to have been executed*."

After the Restoration, the day was again solemnly observed in all the churches of the kingdom; and when the Book of Common Prayer was revised and set forth, the service for the Fifth of November was revised also, and published with the Liturgy. The original service was submitted to the Convocation, by whom several alterations were made, which may be seen by comparing the service published in 1606 with that which is annexed to the Common Prayer subsequent to 1662, and which continued in that state until after the Revolution. In the commencement of the original service are two verses from 1 Timothy ii. 1, 2: in the revised form of 1662 they are

* Birch's *Life of Prince Henry*, p. 61, 62.

omitted. The rubrics, also, in the service of 1662, respecting the method to be adopted when the day falls upon a Sunday or holyday, are not found in the service of 1606. The psalms appointed to be read are also different in the two services. In the service as altered in 1662, and as it stands at present, one of the homilies against rebellion is appointed to be read, whenever there is no sermon, while in that of 1606, no mention is made of anything of the kind*.

The form, as it was revised in 1661, was not submitted to parliament, as the Book of Common Prayer had been: but still it had the sanction of the civil legislature by implication; for, in the *Table of Feasts and Fasts*, in the first edition of The Liturgy, published in 1662, the service for this day is especially alluded to; and that table was established by act of parliament as a part of the book. Under the head of "*Certain Solemn Days, for which particular Services are appointed*," is the following: "*The Fifth Day of November, being the Day of the Papists' Conspiracy.*" As a special service was provided, therefore, it was sanctioned by act of parliament, though not submitted to that assembly; for the above clause, in which the particular form is alluded to, is a part of the book which was confirmed by the Act of Uniformity. I notice this subject, because it has sometimes been said that the occasional services, even in their original state, were not set forth by authority of parliament.

The service of 1662, like the original, was framed to commemorate one event only, namely, the deliverance from the gunpowder plot; but when King William came to the throne, it was deemed desirable, as he had landed on the same day, to commemorate that event also. It became necessary, therefore, to alter the service so as to make it

* I notice these alterations, because the original service is very rare.

suit both events; *first*, the deliverance from the gunpowder treason; and *secondly*, the deliverance of the country from popish tyranny and superstition by the arrival of King William. It has been supposed that the service was altered into its present state by the convocation in 1689; but there is no evidence to prove that such was the case. It seems pretty certain that it was altered by the authority of the crown. A twofold deliverance, therefore, is commemorated in the present *service* for the Fifth of November; *first*, from the powder plot, and *next*, from popery coming in upon the country in a manner more insidious, but not less dangerous, in 1688, when the king on the throne was a papist, and all possible means were used to establish the papal ascendancy.

It was very natural, that the country should have been struck with the circumstance of King William's landing on the Fifth of November,—a day so remarkable in the calendar of the English church. To the Roman Catholics the observance of this day is anything but agreeable; but they can scarcely censure Englishmen for commemorating an event so favourable to Protestantism. Had such a conspiracy been discovered against the church of Rome, all papists would regard the day with special reverence. Protestants are surely to be permitted to enjoy the same liberty, in celebrating the merciful interposition of Providence in rescuing the country from destruction.

The Fifth of November, 1605, and the Fifth of November, 1688, are therefore remarkable days in the annals of England—days never to be forgotten by a grateful people. Had not the Prince of Orange arrived, James would have imposed his yoke upon the English nation. Had he not been resisted, the laws and liberties of the country must have been prostrated in the dust, and the church of England sacrificed to popery.

It was admitted by an illustrious statesman in the seventeenth century, that it was the first interest of England to maintain and defend her Protestant church against popery. "Queen Elizabeth (who by her prudent government hath equalled the greatest kings of Christendom), knowing well the disposition of her state, believed that the true interest thereof consisted, *first* in holding a firm union in itself, deeming (as it is most true) that *England is a mighty animal, which can never die except it kill itself.* She grounded this fundamental maxim, *to banish thence the exercise of the Roman religion*, as the only means to break all the plots of the *Spaniards*, who under this pretext did there foment rebellion." Alluding to some other particulars of that reign, he adds:—"By all these maxims, this wise princess has made known to her successors that besides the interest which the King of England has with all princes, he has yet one *particular*, which is that, *he ought* thoroughly to acquire the advancement of the Protestant religion, even with as much zeal as the King of Spain appears protector of the Catholic." This was the language of a foreigner; and who can deny that it is the interest of our country to keep herself purely Protestant*!

To commemorate our deliverance, the Fifth of November was ordered by act of parliament to be for ever kept holy. That act is still in force; and I am convinced that it will remain in force; for no minister of the crown, however inclined to favour and conciliate the Papists, will ever be so rash as to call for a repeal of that act. Such an attempt would rouse the Protestant feeling of the empire: it would be viewed as a precursor of the complete ascendency of popery. It would cause the Protestants of Eng-

* See *The Interest of the Princes and States of Christendom*, by the Duke De Rohan, translated into English by H. H. Page 53, 12mo. 1641.

land to observe the day with more solemnity than has ever been practised since the passing of the act. Our churches would be opened for worship; our pulpits would resound with the full declaration of the truths of our holy religion against the devices and the corruptions of popery; and the loud song of praise and thanksgiving would be offered up from England's twelve thousand parishes, with such ardour and devotional zeal, that no attempt to crush the expression of public feeling would succeed. If, therefore, a popishly affected ministry should ever venture to repeal the act, they will be under the necessity, if they would repress the demonstration of popular feeling, of passing another act to prevent the doors of our churches from being opened, and the people from assembling together to praise God on the "Fifth of November."

The act of parliament, by which the observance of the day is enjoined, is seldom read, in the present day, in our churches. Some of the clergy have never even seen it. The present work is intended to call the attention of churchmen, and especially of the clergy, to this important subject. Could I be assured that any of my brethren have been led, by the perusal of this volume, to regard the day with more solemnity than usual, I should feel myself amply recompensed for my labours. At the period of the Revolution, and for many years after, the act, as we learn from incidental notices of contemporary writers, was always read by the clergy from the pulpits. The people were then fully sensible of the deliverance, which had been completed on that day; while the clergy invariably directed the attention of their parishioners to the subject; and both clergy and people presented their tribute of gratitude to that gracious Being from whom all good things proceed. And why should the present generation be less mindful of the great deliverance than their ancestors? We have just

as much reason to be thankful as the men of that generation; for if the papists had succeeded in their designs, not only would the liberties of that age have been sacrificed, but those also of succeeding periods. May the Protestants of this kingdom never be forgetful of the glorious Arm by which our salvation from papal thraldom and error was alone effected! Men of the same principles will always, either directly or indirectly, aim at the same ends. The end which all Romanists have in view, is the destruction of the church of England as the greatest bulwark of Protestanism. In past ages this end was sought to be accomplished directly by treason and murder; in the present day the end is attempted by secret means, by an affectation of moderation, and by an avowal of sentiments which are not in reality maintained. Let Protestants ever bear in mind, that the aim of the Romanists is always the same, though the means employed may be varied according to times and circumstances. Ever since the Revolution in 1688, popery, in this country, has worn a mask; but the papal party are now venturing to cast it aside, and to appear in their real character. Within the last few years scenes have been exhibited in this Protestant land, which our ancestors would never for one moment have tolerated. Many Protestants are lukewarm amid these ominous proceedings. May they be grateful to that GRACIOUS BEING, by WHOSE merciful interposition, our church and nation were rescued from destruction on the FIFTH OF NOVEMBER, *One Thousand Six Hundred and Five!* May they be aroused from their present apathy into a spirit similar to that of the men, by whom our deliverance from papal tyranny was effected in ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-EIGHT!

APPENDIX.

No. I.

The Anonymous Letter.

As the question relative to the authorship of the Letter has excited considerable interest, I have reserved the consideration of it for an Appendix, rather than interrupt the narrative by referring to the subject in the body of the work.

When the plot had been concocted and there appeared to be good reason for expecting that it would take effect, the conspirators, as has been remarked, began to express their concern respecting some of the Roman Catholic lords, who would be present at the opening of the session. It was, therefore, agreed that they should endeavour to prevent some of the peers from attending, and that the rest must share the common fate of the great body. It seems that Tresham was very anxious to save Lord Monteagle, and he advised that the execution of the plot should be deferred until the close of the session. As soon, therefore, as the conspiraters heard of the anonymous letter, they suspected Tresham. He, however, stoutly denied all knowledge on the subject. Still it was the general opinion at the time, that he was the writer of the letter. Mr. Jardine thinks that Tresham revealed the particulars to the council, and that the letter was merely a device to cover his treachery*: but the evidence adduced is not sufficient to prove that the government were, in any way, aware of

* Jardine, ii. 68.

the plot before the reception of the anonymous letter. Had such been the case, some proofs would have been discovered in the MSS. in the State Paper Office. It seems most reasonable to suppose that the letter conveyed the first intimation of the treason. The general belief, as already stated, was, that it was written by Tresham; thus, in a work published just after the discovery of the treason, Tresham is positively mentioned as the author*.

During the discussions which took place in the reign of Charles II., on the popish plot, it was asserted that the letter was written by Mrs. Abington, of Hindlip Hall, the sister of Lord Monteagle. This conjecture has been admitted by almost all writers, until within the last few years. The only evidence advanced to show that the letter was written by this lady, was the tradition of the county in which she resided. Mr. Jardine, who has entered upon this question with much ability, rejects this hypothesis altogether, and if the following remarks are correct, there can be no ground for ascribing the authorship to that lady. "No contemporary writer alludes to Mrs. Abington as the author of the letter: and it appears by positive testimony, confirmed by many concurring circumstances, that neither Mr. Abington nor his wife were aware of the plot till after its failure†." When Nash wrote his work on Worcestershire, he found the tradition respecting that lady current in the county. "Tradition in this county, says she was the person who wrote the letter to her brother, which discovered the Gunpowder plot‡." Though, therefore, many persons have expressed themselves satisfied that Mrs. Abington wrote the letter, yet there was no sufficient ground for attributing it to her: nd the fact, which has been brought to light by the State

*. See *The Picture of a Papist*, 4to. p. 124, 1606.

† JARDINE, ii. 62. ‡ NASH'S *Worcestershire*, i. 585.

Papers, that she knew nothing of the plot till after the discovery, would induce the belief that she could not have been the writer.

Within the last few years, another opinion has been advanced, namely, that the letter was written by Anne Vaux, the friend and companion of Garnet. This opinion was first advanced by a writer in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and it is founded on the supposed identity of the hand-writing with that of some undoubted papers of Anne Vaux, now in the State-Paper Office. The same views have been ably put and defended by a writer in the *Times*, of November 30, 1839, under the signature of "Antiquarius." He supposes that Mrs. Abington dictated the letter, and that Anne Vaux wrote it. He thinks that Mrs. Abington was aware of the existence of the plot, and that, consequently, she was anxious to save her brother, Lord Monteagle. This gentleman was first struck, while examining the letters and documents in the State-Paper Office, with a similarity in the hand-writing of the anonymous letter and an original letter of Anne Vaux, which is still preserved. He expressed his opinions to Mr. Lemon, the deputy keeper of the State Papers, who fully agreed with him, though it had not previously occurred to that gentleman. He then adduces several extracts from the examinations to prove Anne Vaux's connexion with Garnet. On this point, indeed, there can be no doubt whatever. "Antiquarius" supposes that Anne Vaux possessed "sufficient knowledge of the intended plot and its details, to render her a very likely instrument to preserve the life of the brother of her friend. And whose hand, if it were, as it must have been, an object to conceal her own, would she have been more likely to employ, as her amanuensis, than that of the same confidante? When we, then, come to find the character of a whole letter, and portions and signatures of some others,

written by that female, identical with that of the letter itself, we surely come as near as historical and documentary evidence can carry us to the conclusion adopted by many, that although it was Mrs. Abington's mind that dictated the letter to her brother, it was the hand of her friend and associate, Miss Vaux, which supplied her with the means of executing her purpose." Mr. Lemon concurred in the same opinion with "Antiquarius."

Wishing to give the substance of all that has been written on the subject, I shall now allude to the opinion of Mr. Jardine. He seems to have arrived at a different conclusion from that of Mr. Lemon and "Antiquarius." "We confess that after a careful examination and comparison of the papers, word by word and letter by letter, we are quite unable to discover the alleged identity of the hand-writing. Besides, there is no evidence that Anne Vaux, any more than Mrs. Abington, knew of the plot before it was discovered: she protests herself that she did not; and there is no proof in any of the examinations to implicate her in the transaction, except her near relationship to some of the conspirators, and her intimacy with all of them*." Mr. Jardine further remarks: "After all, if the letter were really written, as both these conjectures suppose, by a party to the plot, for the mere purpose of saving Lord Monteagle's life by a significant hint, without intending to prevent the execution of the scheme, it is in vain to attempt to discover the author by the hand-writing. To such a person it would have been of the first importance to remain unknown: every precaution and artifice would have been used to prevent the tracing of the letter; and it seems preposterous to suppose that either Anne Vaux, the intimate friend of Lord Monteagle, the near relation of his wife, or Mrs. Abington, his own sister, would have sent the letter

* Jardine, ii. 64.

in question, without taking care effectually to disguise the character of the hand-writing*." Mr. Jardine, in a note, observes that Lord Monteagle must have recognised Anne Vaux's hand, if it were undisguised; and he adds, that in such a case, "the council would not have failed to charge her as a full accomplice to the plot."

Thus the three opinions, to which any importance can be attached, are those which ascribe the anonymous letter to Tresham, to Mrs. Abington, and to Anne Vaux. The reader will form his own conclusion. The general opinion at the time, and for many years after, was, that Tresham was the writer†; the second supposition would ascribe it to Mrs. Abington—this originated in the time of Charles II., and was revived by Nash in the last century; and the last opinion is, that the letter was dictated by Mrs. Abington, and written by Anne Vaux. The question is a very interesting one; and the reader who wishes to peruse the letter on the subject in the *Times* newspaper of November 30th, 1839, will be abundantly rewarded for his trouble. As to the identity in the hand-writing between the anonymous letter and the original letter of Anne Vaux, there seems to be a difference of opinion among those who have carefully examined both documents. Mr. Lemon, and "Antiquarius," are perfectly satisfied that the same hand wrote both the letters: while Mr. Jardine states that he cannot discover the identity. It would be presumption in me even to offer an opinion. Indeed it is not probable that the question will ever be decided, unless other documents should be discovered which may disperse the obscurity in which the matter is still involved.

* JARDINE, ii. 64.

† Dr. Lingard quotes Greenway's manuscript to show that the conspirators believed that the letter proceeded from Tresham. According to this gentleman's views, Tresham wrote the letter, and took care to inform his accomplices that it was in the secretary's hands, in the hope that they would escape.—LINGARD, ix. 52.

No. II.

The Act of Parliament for the Observance of the Fifth of November.

"Forsamuch as Almighty God hath in all ages shewed his power and mercy, in the miraculous and gracious deliverance of his church, and in the protection of religious kings and states, and that no nation of the earth hath been blessed with greater benefits than this nation now enjoyeth, having the true and free profession of the Gospel under our most gracious Sovereign Lord King James, the most great, learned, and religious king that ever reigned therein, enriched with a most hopeful and plentiful progeny, proceeding out of his royal loins, promising continuance of this happiness and profession to all posterity: the which many malignant and devilish papists, jesuits, and seminary priests, much envying and fearing, conspired most horribly when the king's most excellent majesty, the queen, the prince, and all the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, should have been assembled in the Upper House of Parliament upon the Fifth day of November, in the year of our Lord 1605, suddenly to have blown up the said whole house with gunpowder: an invention so inhuman, barbarous, and cruel, as the like was never before heard of, and was (as some of the principal conspirators thereof confess) purposely devised and concluded to be done in the said house, that when sundry necessary and religious laws for preservation of the church and state were made, which they falsely and slanderously call cruel laws, enacted against them and their religion, both place and person should be all destroyed and blown up at once, which would have turned to the utter ruin of this whole kingdom, had

it not pleased Almighty God, by inspiring the king's most excellent majesty with a divine spirit, to interpret some dark phrases of a letter shewed to his majesty, above and beyond all ordinary construction, thereby miraculously discovering this hidden treason not many hours before the appointed time for the execution thereof: therefore the king's most excellent majesty, the lords spiritual and temporal, and all his majesty's faithful and loving subjects, do most justly acknowledge this great and infinite blessing to have proceeded merely from God his great mercy, and to his most holy name do ascribe all honour, glory, and praise: and to the end this unfeigned thankfulness may never be forgotten, but be had in a perpetual remembrance, that all ages to come may yield praises to his Divine Majesty for the same, and have in memory this joyful day of deliverance:

"Be it therefore enacted, by the king's most excellent majesty, the lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that all and singular ministers in every cathedral, and parish-church, or other usual place for common prayer, within this realm of England, and the dominions of the same, shall always upon the Fifth day of November say morning prayer, and give unto Almighty God thanks for this most happy deliverance: and that all and every person and persons inhabiting within this realm of England, and the dominions of the same, shall always upon that day diligently and faithfully resort to the parish-church or chapel accustomed, or to some usual church or chapel, where the said morning prayer, preaching, or other service of God, shall be used, and then and there to abide orderly and soberly during the time of the said prayers, preaching, or other service of God there to be used and ministered.

"And because all and every person may be put in mind

of his duty, and be there better prepared to the said holy service, be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that every minister shall give warning to his parishioners, publicly in the church at morning prayer, the Sunday before every such Fifth day of *November*, for the due observation of the said day. And that after morning prayer or preaching on the said Fifth day of *November*, they read publicly, distinctly, and plainly, the present Act."

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

One Vol. 12mo. Price 6*s*.

THE STATE OF POPERY AND JESUITISM IN ENGLAND, from the Reformation to the Period of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill in 1829.

"We consider this little book to be exceedingly well timed, and highly deserving of perusal by all who are willing to understand the machinery which the Church of Rome puts in motion for the advancement of its cause."—*Times.*

"A clear and practical development of the subtle workings of Popery."—*Church of England Quarterly Review.*

"An opportune and very interesting work."—*Conservative Journal and Church of England Gazette.*

"A useful volume of reference for the series of historical events connected with the subject."—*British Critic.*

"We do not know a modern work of the same size more opportune or more valuable."—*Fraser's Magazine.*

One Vol. 8vo. Price 12*s*.

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH EPISCOPACY, from 1640 to 1662, &c.

"The author has executed his task with very creditable skill, with very laborious research, and with a moderation and impartiality, which entitle him to unqualified commendation. Mr. L. has been abused and misrepresented by one of the organs of that faction which seems to think, that to subvert the constitution, the shortest and most effectual method is by beginning with the Established Church; but will any person of veracity, any person of ordinary decency, say that he has deserved the accusation which the Edinburgh reviewer, with a want of decency peculiarly his own, has brought against him?"—*Times.*

"A very valuable addition to the ecclesiastical literature of the day."—*British Magazine.*

"He tells the tale perspicuously and dispassionately."—*British Critic.*

"A book of much interest, and an important addition to our historical knowledge."—*Literary Gazette.*

"An admirable and well-digested history."—*Frazer's Magazine.*

"Mr. L. has our thanks for endeavouring to illustrate in a popular form a most interesting period of our church annals."—*Church of England Magazine.*

"The sages of the North have traduced him as a malignant. No higher encomium can be desired for any work than to say that it is the production of a writer who has earned such abuse."—*Dublin Christian Examiner.*

"An interesting and valuable history."—*Christian Observer.*

Also, lately Published, price 3*s*.

THE SPANISH ARMADA, A.D. 1588: or The Attempt of Philip II. and Pope Sixtus V. to Re-establish Popery in England.

London:
Harrison and Co., Printers,
St. Martin's Lane.